Disclaimer

The technical reports present data and its analysis, meta-studies and conceptual studies, and are considered to be of value to industry, government or other researchers. Unlike the Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre’s (STCRC’s) Monograph series, these reports have not been subjected to an external peer review process. As such, the scientific accuracy and merit of the research reported here is the responsibility of the authors, who should be contacted for clarification of any content. Author contact details are at the back of this report. The views and opinions of the authors expressed in the reports or by the authors if you contact them do not necessarily state or reflect those of the STCRC.

While all reasonable efforts have been made to gather the most current and appropriate information, the STCRC does not give any warranty as to the correctness, completeness or suitability of the information, and disclaims all responsibility for and shall in no event be liable for any errors or for any loss or damage that might be suffered as a consequence of any person acting or refraining from acting or otherwise relying on this information.

National Library of Australia Cataloguing-in-Publication Entry

Title: ENCORE FESTIVAL AND EVENT EVALUATION KIT: Review and Redevelopment / Katie Schlenker, Carmel Foley, Don Getz.

ISBN: 9781921785146 (pbk) 9781921785641 (pdf)

Subjects: ENCORE (Electronic resource)
            Festivals--Marketing--Evaluation.
            Special events--Marketing--Evaluation.

Author: Schlenker, Katie
Other Authors/Contributors: Foley, Carmel. Getz, Don. CRC for Sustainable Tourism.

Dewey Number: 658.8

Copyright © CRC for Sustainable Tourism Pty Ltd 2010

All rights reserved. Apart from fair dealing for the purposes of study, research, criticism or review as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part of this book may be reproduced by any process without written permission from the publisher. Any enquiries should be directed to:

General Manager, Communications and Industry Extension or Publishing Manager, info@crctourism.com.au

First published in Australia in 2010 by CRC for Sustainable Tourism Pty Ltd

Printed in Australia (Gold Coast, Queensland)
CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY NOTE ................................................................................................................................. iv

ABSTRACT ........................................................................................................................................................ iv

SUMMARY ........................................................................................................................................................ v

   Objectives of Study ......................................................................................................................................... v
   Methodology ..................................................................................................................................................... v
   Key Findings ................................................................................................................................................... v
   Future Action .................................................................................................................................................... v

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION ............................................................................................................................ 1

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY ............................................................................................................................ 2

CHAPTER 3: CRITIQUE OF ENCORE FESTIVAL AND EVENT EVALUATION KIT .................................................... 3

   User Survey .................................................................................................................................................. 3
   Secondary Data Analysis ................................................................................................................................. 3
   Summary ...................................................................................................................................................... 4

CHAPTER 4: INFORMING THE NEW DESIGN .................................................................................................... 5

   Industry Reference Group ............................................................................................................................. 5
   Literature Review .......................................................................................................................................... 5
   Summary ...................................................................................................................................................... 8

CHAPTER 5: TESTING AND REDESIGN .......................................................................................................... 10

   Attendee Survey .......................................................................................................................................... 10
   Host Community Social Impacts Survey ......................................................................................................... 10
   Organiser Economic Survey .......................................................................................................................... 10
   Organiser Environmental Impact Checklist .................................................................................................. 10
   Summary ...................................................................................................................................................... 11

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .................................................................................. 12

   Web-Based Tool .......................................................................................................................................... 12
   Data Collection/Input Technologies ............................................................................................................... 12
   Training and Support .................................................................................................................................... 13
   Further Testing .............................................................................................................................................. 13

APPENDIX A: WEBSITE DESIGN AND CONTENT ............................................................................................ 14

APPENDIX B: WEBSITE DESIGN – GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION ...................................................................... 17

APPENDIX C: DEFAULT OPTION INSTRUMENTS ............................................................................................... 17

   Default Instrument 1: Simple Attendee Survey ............................................................................................ 18
   Default Instrument 2: Comprehensive Attendee Survey .............................................................................. 20
   Default Instrument 3: Host Community Social Impacts Survey ................................................................... 24
   Default Instrument 4: Organiser Economic Survey ..................................................................................... 29
   Default Instrument 5: Organiser Environmental Impact Checklist .............................................................. 32

REFERENCES ..................................................................................................................................................... 44

AUTHORS ......................................................................................................................................................... 48
ENCORE FESTIVAL AND EVENT EVALUATION KIT: Review and Redevelopment

Introductory Note

This document reports on the first stage of a two stage project to review and redesign the STCRC ENCORE Festival and Event Evaluation Kit (ENCORE). The purpose of this project was to provide a critique of the current ENCORE product and make recommendations to guide the STCRC in future design and development of a revised model. The second stage of the project was to involve the design and development of a revised ENCORE product, based on the results of the Stage 1 research. This second stage would also see the transfer of this revised ENCORE product to an online, web-based platform. While this second stage of the research has not progressed, the results of the ENCORE review (Stage 1 research) are presented in this report.

Abstract

This was the first of a two stage project to review and redesign the STCRC ENCORE Festival and Event Evaluation Kit (ENCORE). The purpose of this project was to provide a critique of the current ENCORE product and make recommendations to guide the STCRC in future design and development of a revised model. The current ENCORE model provides a sound measure of direct inscope expenditure\(^1\) but could be expanded to include social and environmental dimensions to achieve a triple bottom line (TBL) approach. Academics who have used the current model have reported that it is sound, reliable and useful. In contrast, the majority of event organisers who have purchased and trialled the product report that the current model is too complex for comfortable and effective use by their event evaluation staff. The findings indicate that the majority of organisers of smaller festivals and events do not have access to personnel with the level of research skills and resources required to complete an effective event evaluation without ongoing support and training (which wasn’t perceived to be widely available with the current model).

A revised paper-based event evaluation tool was developed and field tested at the 2010 CountryLink Parkes Elvis Festival. The model incorporated a TBL approach and included comprehensive community, attendee and organiser survey instruments for measuring host community perceptions of the social impacts of the event, motivations for and satisfaction with attending the event, and inscope expenditure. The instruments also facilitated the collection of demographic and marketing data, and an environmental checklist was completed by organisers. Interviews with field researchers and organisers and examination of the data resulted in minor modifications to the proposed tool.

It is recommended that the STCRC facilitate the development of a web-based event evaluation tool with a user-friendly interface and user access to ongoing training and support. While much of the questionnaire content has been field tested as part of this study, we recommend that further development of the new tool involve extensive field testing among event evaluation researchers to ensure its usability in the event marketplace.

A web-based tool has the potential to contribute to the collection of data from a broad range of events, providing an extensive database for academics, NTOs and STOs involved in research, planning and policy making for the Australian/global events industry.
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1 Inscope expenditure, also referred to as ‘new expenditure’ is “expenditure that would not have occurred in the host region had the event not taken place” (Jago & Dwyer, 2006, p. 8). This includes the event-induced expenditure of a range of stakeholders in the event, such as event attendees, participants, exhibitors and organisers.
SUMMARY

Objectives of Study
- To provide a robust review and critique of the existing STCRC ENCORE Festival and Event Evaluation Kit (ENCORE);
- To identify necessary product modifications in light of developments in event evaluation literature and user experiences with the product;
- To design the templates for a revised product to meet the requirements of a range of users from organisers of smaller events and festivals conducting a simple event evaluation, through to event organisers, STOs, NTO and government authorities, conducting a comprehensive evaluation of medium-large events;
- To test the revised ENCORE templates in the event evaluation process of a medium sized event; and
- To provide recommendations to guide Stage 2 of the project – the design and development of a revised ENCORE product.

Methodology
- Review of developments in event evaluation literature;
- Secondary data analysis and user interviews to critique existing product;
- Interviews with key industry leaders to guide design of new templates;
- Design of new templates incorporating TBL dimensions;
- Testing of social, environmental, and economic survey instruments in the event evaluation of a medium sized event.

Key Findings
- Developments in event evaluation literature incorporate a TBL focus. Inscope expenditure is a sound model for benchmarking and collection of baseline economic data. A residents’ perception model is the preferred method for measuring social impacts on host communities. An environmental checklist is a practical tool for event organisers who wish to begin focusing on environmental impacts, whereas carbon calculators require higher levels of input from organisers and a small section of the industry is currently motivated to use tools at this level.
- The majority of purchasers of the current ENCORE tool are organisers of smaller events and festivals and have not used the product. Those who have trialled it report many difficulties with its usability. This is in contrast to academics who have tested the product and are comfortable with the usability and integrity of the program.
- The majority of event organisers who have purchased the product lack personnel with the research skills required to use ENCORE effectively. They require access to training and ongoing support to manage use of the tool;
- STOs see potential for use of a revised ENCORE product by organisers of smaller events and festivals – particularly if it can address problems mentioned above;
- STOs have developed their own models for event evaluation and do not predict ‘in-house’ use of the existing or revised ENCORE products;
- The revised templates tested successfully at the 2010 CountryLink Parkes Elvis Festival.

Future Action
- A web-based design is recommended for the development of the new product;
- The web-based design will need to be tested for usability with event organisers;
- Training and support will be required for the majority of event organisers who purchase the new product.
Chapter 1:

INTRODUCTION

Over the past three decades there has been an explosion in the number and significance of events held in communities large and small (DeLisle, 2009) in both developing and developed economies. Events are being used to revitalise tourism in regional areas as well as major cities. Most governments see events as a legitimate and effective way to brand cities. Securing, creating, staging and retaining major events is a global and highly competitive business (Victorian Auditor General, 2007).

In Australia, state agencies have been established to strategically plan and manage the event landscape. Evaluation plays a significant role in the planning process. State agencies are involved in event evaluation in two main ways. First, they evaluate key events to collect data (marketing, demographic, economic) for their own organisational needs. Second, they provide support and guidance for organisers of smaller/community events in evaluating their own events.

Organisers of smaller/community events often lack the financial, human and skill set resources required to evaluate their events effectively. Those who make the effort to evaluate their events risk compromising the integrity of their research because of a lack of skills and/or resources. The original ENCORE Festival and Event Evaluation Kit (ENCORE) was designed to assist with the process of event evaluation, alleviating some of the problems identified by providing sound questionnaires and reporting templates for event organisers to collect data on inscope expenditure as well as marketing and demographic information. However, a number of ENCORE users have experienced problems with the usability of the current tool (see Chapter 3). The revised model aims to provide a simpler, user friendly tool for evaluating events.

In line with contemporary values and community expectations, event evaluation is evolving. In addition to the economic bottom line, communities and government agencies are becoming increasingly concerned with the social and environmental impacts of events. Event organisers have come to recognise that events not aligned to the environmental and social values of their host communities are not likely to last more than a couple of years (Fredline, Jago, & Deery, 2003). This trend is reflected in the growth of triple bottom line (TBL) event evaluation literature.

In addition to improving usability, the revised ENCORE model will offer event organisers tools for evaluating the impacts of their events from social, environmental and economic perspectives. Cutting edge research has been used to inform the design of the new models.

The revised ENCORE product will provide a platform for consistency and benchmarking of economic impacts within and between events on an organisational, regional, national or global scale as well as a more comprehensive understanding of social and environmental impacts through the use of highly flexible tools that can be tailored to the specific requirements of each unique event.

The key objectives of this project were:

- To provide a robust review and critique of the existing STCRC ENCORE Festival and Event Evaluation Kit (ENCORE);
- To identify necessary product modifications in light of developments in event evaluation literature and user experiences with the product;
- To design the templates for a revised product to meet the requirements of a range of users from organisers of smaller events and festivals conducting a simple event evaluation, through to event organisers, STOs, NTO and government authorities, conducting a comprehensive evaluation of medium-large events;
- To test the revised ENCORE templates in the event evaluation process of a medium sized event; and
- To provide recommendations to guide Stage 2 of the project – the design and development of a revised ENCORE product.
Chapter 2:

METHODOLOGY

To address the research objectives the research team completed a literature review, a survey of current ENCORE users and analysis of secondary data, as well as interviews with state event agency representatives.

Since the development of the existing ENCORE product, significant progress has been made in event evaluation literature, particularly in the area of triple bottom line reporting. Developments in the literature mirror a growing awareness and concern in the wider community about social and environmental issues generally. Events are not exempt from these concerns. Indeed, the Victorian Auditor General (2007) has recommended a triple bottom line approach to event evaluation.

In order for government to be more comprehensively apprised of the full range of major event impacts, post-event assessments should be broadened to take, where practicable, a triple bottom line approach embracing not only economic but social and environmental factors (p.3).

A literature review was conducted, drawing on event evaluation literature relevant to triple bottom line reporting with specific focus on the environmental, social and economic impacts of events.

A survey of current ENCORE users and analysis of secondary data contributed to a comprehensive appraisal of the existing ENCORE product.

The ENCORE user survey encompassed a questionnaire survey completed with 71 representatives of organisations who purchased the ENCORE product between 2006-09. The questionnaire survey was administered via telephone. Of the 71 event organisations that completed the questionnaire only 22 had attempted to use the ENCORE tool. Only a small number of these organisations agreed to being involved in further research, which limited the ability of the team to conduct follow-up interviews. A total of eight follow up interviews were conducted with ENCORE users. Findings of the questionnaire survey were instrumental in shaping the themes explored in the in-depth interviews, administered via telephone. An interview schedule was developed and used to guide the interviews with ENCORE users.

Secondary data comprises reports by Haydon (2006) and Tremblay, Boyle, Rigby, & Haydon (2006) who used the existing ENCORE product to evaluate events and provided feedback on required modifications. These reports have been analysed and contribute to the critique of the existing ENCORE product.

In-depth semi structured interviews were completed with each member of the project’s Industry Reference Group (IRG). Each IRG member was issued with a project summary prior to interview. An interview schedule was developed and used to guide each interview. The purpose of these interviews was twofold:

- to ensure that the research team received feedback on the overall project aims, objectives and direction; and
- to familiarise the research team with parallel efforts by state level event agencies to improve procedures for event evaluation in their jurisdictions.

All IRG and ENCORE user interviews were transcribed by ESCRIBE Digital Transcription Services.
Chapter 3:

CRITIQUE OF ENCORE FESTIVAL AND EVENT EVALUATION KIT

The ENCORE Festival and Event Evaluation Kit (ENCORE) was developed by the Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre (STCRC) with the aim of providing festival and event organisers with a tool to “assess the magnitude of new funds that are attracted to the host region as a result of staging the festival or event” (Jago, 2005, p. 1), as well as to collect key demographic, marketing and visitor satisfaction data. Since its inception in 2005 ENCORE has become a core component of event planning for a number of groups including the South Australian Government, Coloc Otway Shire Council, Mildura City Council and Gold Coast Council.

Key findings from the user surveys and analysis of secondary data are presented in this chapter. These findings offer a robust critique of the current ENCORE product and insight into the various ways in which a revised model could contribute to the events industry.

User Survey

The ENCORE user survey encompassed a questionnaire survey completed with 71 representatives of organisations who purchased the ENCORE product in the period 2006-9, plus in-depth interviews with eight ENCORE users. This section provides a breakdown of issues raised in this survey.

Key findings from the ENCORE user survey can be summarised as follows.

- The findings indicate that the majority of purchasers of ENCORE have not used the product. Those who have trialled it are not particularly happy with it and report many difficulties with its usability (e.g. the questionnaire is too long, some of the questions do not ‘make sense’, the questionnaire is too difficult for respondents to self-complete, data entry is cumbersome). The questions related to inscope expenditure were considered to be particularly problematic. This is in contrast to academics who have tested the product and are comfortable with the usability and the integrity of the program.

- A key complaint was the lack of training provided. The majority of users were not comfortable with using the manual to train themselves. They felt they needed person to person training. This may need to be costed into the next version of the tool. An online tutorial may not suffice for this group of users.

- The new product will need a support system to answer questions and help with evaluations. It can be put online, complete with demonstrations and tutorials. Potentially, the organisation(s) managing the new product could charge a fee for consulting/analytical services.

- Training users is important, or ‘training the trainers’, and this could be a role for the universities. Without effective post sales support and appropriate demonstrations of how the software operates, there is little chance that products like ENCORE will be effective in the market.

- The development of a simple and straightforward questionnaire template without any economic questions (which seem to cause the majority of problems for current users) may alleviate many of the problems currently experienced by users.

Secondary Data Analysis

This section unpacks critiques of ENCORE provided in reports by Haydon (2006) and Tremblay et al (2006). Each group of researchers tested the ENCORE tool and provided feedback on required modifications.

Key findings from the secondary data analysis that have informed the design of the new tool include:

- Greater flexibility (ordering of questions, inclusion/exclusion of questions, break points in demographic categories, use of skip logic) is required wherever possible.

- Careful attention needs to be paid to the wording of questions so that meaning is clear and unambiguous to both data collectors and respondents.

- The new tool needs to take into account that not all users will be experienced with research terminology and techniques.

- Economic evaluation may not be the first priority for all events, particularly community events – social impacts need to be incorporated.
The new tool requires a TBL focus.

Summary
In summary, the current tool provides a sound basis for measuring economic impacts (in terms of inscope expenditure) but does not incorporate social or environmental dimensions. Users experienced in research methodology are comfortable with using the tool and consider it sound and reliable. The majority of users did not have the research skills or resources needed to manage the tool effectively. Ongoing support and training is considered to be a vital component of any new tool.
Chapter 4:

INFORMING THE NEW DESIGN

Key findings from the IRG interviews and literature review are presented in this section. These findings offer guidance for the design of the new ENCORE product and insight into the various ways in which the new tool could contribute to the events industry.

Industry Reference Group

Face to face interviews were conducted with representatives of the different state level agencies who formed the Industry Reference Group (IRG) for this project.

Key findings from the IRG interviews that have informed the design of the new tool are as follows.

- A simple and straightforward tool needs to be designed for ease of administration by less experienced researchers so that problems with reliability of data are less likely to occur.
- For the more experienced researcher and for those critical moments when resources are made available for a comprehensive evaluation of chosen aspects of events (e.g., economic, social or environmental) a more comprehensive model is appropriate.
- The majority of users will need guidance and support with research methodology to ensure validity of findings.
- Cutting edge and field tested research and international best practice should inform the design of the social and environmental impact components of the new tool.
- Inscope expenditure measures designed for the original ENCORE tool are considered sound and the most appropriate model for benchmarking purposes and should therefore be retained.

Literature Review

Research into the impacts of events is increasing because of the growing number of events being held, and because of a growing recognition of the impacts, both positive and negative, that these events can have on host communities (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001). There is also increasing recognition of the need for assessments to move beyond the purely economic justifications for events. Increasingly, the social and environmental impacts are considered just as important in calculating the overall success or outcomes of an event (Allen, O'Toole, McDonnell, & Harris, 2005; Hall, 1993). This stems from a recognition that it is counterproductive “to concentrate on the economic dimension to the exclusion of other perspectives on festivals and events” (Getz, 1991, p. 39).

Economic Impacts

The initial focus of event impact research was on the economic dimension. A substantial body of research has focused on assessing the economic impacts of events (Burns, Hatch, & Mules, 1986; Crompton, Lee, & Shuster, 2001; Dwyer, Mellor, Mistilis, & Mules, 2000b; McCann & Thompson, 1992; Tyrrell & Johnston, 2001). Emphasis is often placed on this aspect because, in part, “the success of a festival or event is commonly measured in terms of its economic contribution to event stakeholders, the community and the region” (Dimmock & Tiyce, 2001, p. 364).

Evaluation of the economic impacts of events is important for event organisers who must be able to justify their activities to a range of stakeholders including sponsors, funding bodies, as well as the wider host community. Additionally, as more events look to governments and other bodies as funding sources, such organisations require event evaluations in order to assess the value of their investments (Jago & Dwyer, 2006).

A variety of approaches exist for measuring the economic impact of events including cost benefit analysis (Jackson, Houghton, Russell, & Triandos, 2005), computable general equilibrium models (CGE) (Dwyer, Forsyth, & Spurr, 2004), input output models (I-O) (Chhabra, Sills, & Cubbage, 2003) and inscope expenditure (Jago & Dwyer, 2006). Each model has strengths and weaknesses and its own set of underlying assumptions. Critics argue that while I-O techniques are straightforward and relatively easy to administer, they account for only the positive impacts of an event and ignore the negative impacts that may be occurring in other parts of the industry.
ECONOMY AS A RESULT OF THE EVENT. THESE NEGATIVE IMPACTS CAN BE SIGNIFICANT, PARTICULARLY IF THE EVENT IS LARGE AND HELD IN A MAJOR CITY. THE ACTUAL NET IMPACT OF EVENTS ON ECONOMIC ACTIVITY, EXCEPT ON THE LOCAL AREA, WILL PROBABLY BE MUCH LOWER THAN IS ESTIMATED USING THE I-O TECHNIQUE (DYER, FORSYTH, & SPURR, 2006). CGE MODELLING ALSO HAS ITS CRITICS. CGE MODELS ARE REQUIRED TO MAKE TOO MANY ASSUMPTIONS, MAKING THEM TOO COSTLY AND COMPLEX TO USE (DYER, ET AL., 2006). WIDELY DIFFERING RESULTS CAN BE ACHIEVED DEPENDING ON THE MODEL USED TO MEASURE ECONOMIC IMPACT. DIFFERING ASSUMPTIONS LEAD, INEVITABLY, TO DIFFERENT CONCLUSIONS.


IN ORDER TO OVERTIME THIS PROBLEM, IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT INSCOPE EXPENDITURE BE USED AS THE BASELINE DATA FOR REPORTING ON THE ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE OF AN EVENT. INSCOPE EXPENDITURE, OR "NEW EXPENDITURE" IS "EXPENDITURE THAT WOULD NOT HAVE OCCURRED IN THE HOST REGION HAD THE EVENT NOT TAKEN PLACE" (JAGO & DYER, 2006, P. 8). THIS INCLUDES THE EVENT-INDUCED EXPENDITURE OF A RANGE OF STAKEHOLDERS IN THE EVENT, SUCH AS EVENT ATTENDEES, PARTICIPANTS, EXHIBITORS AS WELL AS ORGANISERS. THE CALCULATION OF INSCOPE EXPENDITURE DOES NOT EQUATE TO THE "ECONOMIC IMPACT" OF AN EVENT, BUT RATHER INSCOPE EXPENDITURE IS THE BASE COMPONENT OF ANY ECONOMIC MODEL DESIGNED TO CALCULATE ECONOMIC IMPACT. A RECOMMENDATION FOR THE USE OF INSCOPE EXPENDITURE AS A MEASURE OF THE ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE OF AN EVENT IS IN LINE WITH JAGO & DYER (2006) WHO STATE THAT "DIRECT INSCOPE EXPENDITURE CAN BE A BASIS FOR COMPARING THE ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE OF AN EVENT OVER TIME AS WELL AS BETWEEN EVENTS WITHOUT BECOMING SIDETRACKED BY THE DEBATE OVER WHICH MULTIPLIER TO USE" (P. 41).


SOCIAL IMPACTS


A NUMBER OF METHODOLOGIES HAVE BEEN TRIalled FOR MEASURING SOCIAL IMPACTS. THE CONTINGENT VALUATION (CV) METHODOLOGY (Lindberg & Johnson, 1997) MEASURES CONSUMERS’ WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR NON-MARKET-GOODS BY ASKING RESIDENTS TO ASSIGN A MONETARY VALUE TO SOCIAL IMPACTS. WHILE THIS APPROACH FACILITATES THE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL IMPACTS BY ASSIGNING THEM AN ECONOMIC VALUE IT HAS MET WITH LIMITED SUCCESS. MANY RESPONDENTS HAVE DIFFICULTY WITH THIS PROCESS AND NOT ALL SOCIAL IMPACTS CAN BE MEASURED THIS WAY (Ohmann, JONES, & Wilkes, 2006). SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (SIA) TECHNIQUES MEASURE SOCIAL IMPACTS USING A QUANTITATIVE METHODOLOGY. THIS APPROACH SUPPORTS THE OBJECTIVE MEASURE OF IMPACTS SUCH AS A CHANGE IN THE LEVEL OF CRIME IN A REGION THROUGH POLICE RECORDS (Fredline, et al., 2003). AGAIN THIS METHOD HAS MET WITH ONLY LIMITED SUCCESS. THERE ARE ONLY A LIMITED NUMBER OF SOCIAL IMPACTS THAT CAN BE QUANTIFIED IN THIS MANNER (Ohmann, et al., 2006).
A residents' perceptions approach allows residents to make comment on the impacts that a specific event has had on them. Such an approach is particularly important for the examination of social impacts that are often difficult to measure objectively since they cannot be easily quantified. Moreover, if residents perceive that certain impacts are occurring, it is this belief rather than any objective reality that will be important in affecting their attitudes and behaviours towards tourism or an event (Hall, 2003). Social impacts are therefore best examined through an investigation of residents’ perceptions (Fredline et al., 2003).

Advocates of residents’ perceptions research typically cite two important reasons for such studies to be undertaken. First, residents’ perceptions studies are seen to be important because of the role they can play in providing essential information for planning agencies. “The perceptions and attitudes of residents towards the impacts of tourism are likely to be an important planning and policy consideration for the successful development, marketing, and operation of existing and future tourism programs and projects” (Ap, 1992, p. 665). Second, some argue that a host community that is positively disposed to tourism will enhance the experience of tourists and contribute to the destination’s attractiveness (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Kang, Long, & Perdue, 1996; Madrigal, 1995; Waitt, 2003). In line with this, a lack of support within a resident population could threaten the existence of future tourism in a destination (Fredline & Faulkner, 2002a). These findings are equally applicable to events as they are to tourism more generally. Residents’ perceptions of the social impacts of an event need to be monitored and considered throughout the planning process in order to minimise identified negative impacts and optimise benefits for the host community (Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Kang, et al., 1996).

Environmental Impacts

The relationship between mankind and the physical environmental impacts is one of the core underpinnings of the sustainable development movement in the second half of the twentieth century. This period of history is littered with a series of events which have called into question the finite nature of our planet and the sustainable use of common resources. The concepts of global warming and climate change are well known and have done much to precipitate a broad community interest in the principles of environmental impact assessment.

In spite of the growth in awareness of environmental issues in the general community, environmental impact research has lagged behind research on the social impacts, and even more so, the economic impacts of events (Fredline, Raybould, Jago, & Deery, 2005; Getz, 2008; Sherwood, 2007). However, this is changing. Over recent years, mega events have come to realise the extent of their influence on the environment. Recent Olympic Games have for instance included strategic environmental impact assessment for all new and existing venues. The IOC President Jacques Rogues has made the following statement:

Caring for the environment is an important part of the work of the Olympic Movement. If sport events and activities are not planned and managed carefully, they can cause degradation of the natural environment. Equally important is the collective responsibility of those involved in sport to ensure that athletes and sport participants are able to train and compete in clean and healthy conditions. We also recognise there are many opportunities for sport, including sport events like the Olympic Games, to provide sustainable environmental legacies (International Olympic Committee, 2009).

One approach used to evaluate the environmental impacts of events is ecological footprint analysis. The basic premise behind ecological footprint analysis is to ‘express using space equivalents the appropriation of biological productive areas by individuals or nations’ (Gossling, Hasson, Horstmeier, & Saggel, 2002, p. 201). Another approach to evaluate the environmental impacts of events is to calculate the carbon emissions that can be attributed to the staging of an event.

Ecological footprint and carbon calculator analyses aggregate the impacts of different consumption activities into a single measure, offering organisers and policymakers the potential to identify and compare the environmental impact of different visitor activities such as transport, waste and energy use. These measures provide the potential for policymakers and event organisers to prioritise their actions in a more informed and integrated manner. Used sensitively, these tools can provide a benchmark against which environmental impacts can be calculated. The tools can also be used to analyse the impact of different policy options; for example, sourcing local food and beverage options in place of imported products (Collins & Flynn, 2008).
At the time of writing, there are several tools available to the events industry for assessing the environmental impacts of events. Many of these are free to use, provided by government bodies and not-for-profit organisations; there are also a number of commercial environmental auditing products on the market (Sustainability Victoria, 2009).

EPA Victoria has developed a Carbon and Ecological Footprint Events Calculator (EPA Victoria, ND). The calculator includes the necessary questionnaires for delegates, venues and exhibitors, aimed at measuring the “event’s impact in a way that is broader than just greenhouse gas pollution” (Sustainability Victoria, 2009, p. 3). In this case, the appropriation of biological productive area is defined in terms of: general event characteristics, venue characteristics, accommodation characteristics, catering, print/promotional items, travel and recycling/waste (Sustainability Victoria, 2009).

A recent Event Carbon Calculator to enter the market is that developed by the Australian Centre for Event Management. Aspects of this model include the generation of a rolling emission value breakdown for each indicator item (including venue, transport, food & drink, gifts, and contractor services); easy to navigate user interface; and the inclusion of low carbon event tips to guide future event development (Australian Centre for Event Management, ND).

Carbon calculators are gaining popularity in the events industry, particularly with organisers of events that have a significant ‘green’ focus. However, many other event organisers are more concerned with managing environmental impacts than measuring them.

In a study of nine events in Western Australia Jones, Pilgrim, Thompson & Macgregor (2008) found that the environmental impacts identified by organisers and/or hosts as the most important were transport (parking and traffic), waste management (general rubbish collection, litter, recycling and the provision of toilets) and noise. For six of the events, mention was also made of putting measures in place to promote environmental awareness. Environmental impacts/issues perceived as less significant included the provision of power (for outdoor events), air pollution (smoke haze and vehicle emissions), management of environmental risk and the minimisation of environmental harm. Significantly, Jones et al. (2008) found little interest among event organisers for measuring environmental impacts. They were more interested in dealing with the ‘on the ground’ management of issues such as parking and waste management.

The calculation of environmental impacts is … problematic, due to the limited availability of data for most of the perceived environmental impacts and the limited enthusiasm of both organisers and hosts to collect such data (Jones, et al., 2008, p. vi).

Collins, Jones & Munday (2008) also found problems with the input requirements of an ecological footprint or carbon calculator. Data collection for event-specific consumption can be resource intensive. It is often very difficult to access data for all areas of visitor consumption, for example, measures of energy use in visitor accommodation.

In contrast to ecological footprint or carbon calculator tools which aim to assess the environmental impacts of events, an environmental checklist represents a practical self evaluation tool for event organisers, with the aim of improving an event’s environmental performance over time. There are countless green and/or environmental checklists available online (See Australian Centre for Event Management, 2009a, 2009b), many of which have been consulted for this project (Business Events Australia, 2009; Event Scotland, 2009; Government Office for the South West, ND; Live Earth, 2009; Sustainable Living Foundation, ND).

For the majority of event organisers a checklist measuring environmental performance and offering tips for ameliorating impacts may prove to be a more useful tool than a calculator (Jones, et al., 2008). It is also recommended by Jones et al. (2008) that an environmental checklist be developed to serve as an approval form for submission by event organisers to local and state authorities.

Summary

The inscope expenditure model as exists in the current ENCORE tool should be retained. Inscope expenditure is considered to be a sound model for benchmarking and provides the baseline data for other measures of economic impact.
A focus on the social impacts of events on a host community is necessary since dissatisfaction amongst the community is likely to have negative implications for the current success and long-term sustainability of an event. A number of methodologies have been trialled for measuring social impacts, however, the literature indicates that social impacts are best examined through an investigation of residents’ perceptions (Fredline, et al., 2003; Small, 2007b). A residents’ perception survey should be included as a feature of the revised model.

The events industry is beginning to come to terms with issues of environmental sustainability. While the majority of event organisers do not have the resources or inclination to complete more than a simple environmental checklist to gauge the sustainability of their events, a small number of organisers have embraced carbon calculator analyses in an attempt to improve and/or offset the ecological footprint of their event. A proposed three stage model of measuring environmental impacts will provide event organisers with choice and for those who are still coming to grips with this aspect of event evaluation, room to develop. An Environmental Impact Checklist is a practical self evaluation tool for event organisers concerned with managing the environmental impacts of their event in areas such as event planning; venue and site selection; promotions, merchandising and education; water; waste; energy; catering; accommodation; travel and transport. Event organisers can select which of these categories are relevant to their event, and answer the questions within the selected categories. A second level to the checklist can be utilised for those events that wish to monitor their performance in the key impact areas of energy, water, waste, and travel and transport. The recording of simple measures in these areas (e.g. kilograms of waste to landfill; litres of water consumed) will allow events to benchmark against themselves and monitor their environmental performance over the years. A Carbon Calculator Survey is recommended for event organisers who wish to move beyond a checklist approach, and do more than record simple measures in the key impact areas of waste, water and energy etc. The new ENCORE tool could provide a link to one or more existing carbon calculator tools (Australian Centre for Event Management, ND; EPA Victoria, ND; Origin Energy, ND) that are freely available online. The recommended carbon calculators will allow event organisers to measure the environmental impact of an event in terms of the carbon emissions that can be attributed to its staging.
Chapter 5: TESTING AND REDESIGN

Extending from the existing ENCORE Festival and Event Evaluation Kit, a set of instruments was designed to:

- Address product critiques and user issues with ENCORE;
- Incorporate developments in TBL event evaluation tools and techniques; and
- Address event industry concerns and requirements regarding event evaluation and reporting.

The revised ENCORE instruments were tested at the 2010 CountryLink Parkes Elvis Festival (6th - 10th January).

Attendee Survey

An attendee survey was administered on site during the festival using a three-page written (i.e. paper) survey instrument. A research team of five people surveyed a total of 371 festival attendees over a three-day period (8th - 10th January 2010). The attendee survey gathered basic visitation data, travel characteristics, demographics, marketing information, motivations for attendance, satisfaction, and expenditure data necessary to calculate the inscope expenditure resulting from the event.

Host Community Social Impacts Survey

A phone survey of 403 Parkes residents was administered approximately two weeks following the 2010 CountryLink Parkes Elvis Festival. The purpose of the survey was to gather residents’ perceptions on the social impacts that may have resulted from the hosting of the festival. The survey asked residents to comment on the occurrence of a range of social impacts, and how they feel about such outcomes, answering on a scale ranging from a very negative outcome, through to a very positive outcome, with a neutral midpoint. The scale, featured in Section B of the questionnaire, was developed in a previous study by Small (2007b). Also included were some basic demographics and questions on the level of interest and involvement in the festival by residents.

Organiser Economic Survey

The organisers of the 2010 CountryLink Parkes Elvis Festival completed an organiser economic survey to assist in the calculation of the inscope expenditure resulting from the festival. The survey asked for details on income and expenditure resulting from the festival, including the percentage breakdown for each income/expenditure category that was received from outside the Parkes region and State of NSW. Organisers were also required to provide an estimate of event attendance, along with an explanation of how the attendance figure was arrived at.

Organiser Environmental Impact Checklist

The organisers of the 2010 CountryLink Parkes Elvis Festival completed part 1 of an environmental impact checklist, designed as a practical self evaluation tool for event organisers concerned with managing the environmental impacts of their event. The checklist addresses areas including event planning; venue and site selection; promotions, merchandising and education; water; waste; energy; catering; accommodation; travel and transport. Organisers can select which of these categories are relevant to their event, and answer the questions within the selected categories. There is a second level to the checklist for those events that wish to monitor their performance in the key impact areas of energy, water, waste, and travel and transport. The recording of simple measures in these areas (e.g. kilograms of waste to landfill; litres of water consumed) will allow events to benchmark against themselves and monitor their environmental performance over the years. This second part of the checklist was not relevant in the case of the 2010 CountryLink Parkes Elvis Festival, and therefore, will require further testing with an appropriate event.
Summary

Following testing at the 2010 CountryLink Parkes Elvis Festival data were analysed and the reporting output produced was examined by the research team. Field researchers involved in testing of the attendee survey and host community survey were interviewed and feedback was sought on the performance of the surveys, and the need for modifications. Feedback was also gained from the festival organisers on both the economic survey and environmental impact checklist, with feedback providing guidance on necessary modifications.

All instruments tested well and only minor modifications were necessary. The revised instruments and recommendations for their appropriate use are discussed in Appendix C.
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Chapter 6:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The aim of this study was to provide a robust critique of the ENCORE Festival and Event Evaluation Kit (ENCORE) and to make recommendations to guide the STCRC in future design and development of a revised model.

In response to product critiques, user issues with the current tool, developments in TBL event evaluation literature and industry concerns regarding event evaluation and reporting, it is recommended that the STCRC facilitate the development of a web-based event evaluation tool. Specific recommendations to guide the design and development of a revised ENCORE product are set out below.

Web-Based Tool

It is recommended that the STCRC facilitate the development of a web-based event evaluation tool with a user-friendly interface and user access to ongoing training and support.

A web-based tool has the potential to contribute to the collection of data from a broad range of events, providing an extensive database for academics, NTOs and STOs involved in research, planning and policy making for the Australian/global events industry.

It is proposed that the website design would include a number of tiers (see appendix A for a full outline). The first tier would be an introduction page, outlining the purpose of event evaluation and the features of the tool. Users might then be directed to input some basic data about their event (e.g., name of event, type of event). The third tier would ask users to decide what information they want – for example, ‘Do you want to know the impacts your event is having on the host community?’. Based on their choices, users will be initially directed to ready to use (default) survey instruments (see examples in Appendix C).

The default set of survey instruments includes a simple attendee questionnaire template (easy to manage), a comprehensive attendee questionnaire template (includes in-scope expenditure questions), an organiser economic survey (to be completed in conjunction with comprehensive attendee survey), an environmental checklist for completion by organisers, and a host community social impacts questionnaire template. This set of instruments was field tested at the 2010 CountryLink Parkes Elvis Festival. It is recommended that these templates be offered as a default option as part of the design of a new web-based version of the tool.

As an alternative to the default survey option, it is proposed that users be able to build their own survey instrument. If they opt to build their own instrument they will be directed to the appropriate ‘basket’ of questions. It is proposed that question baskets will be available to users, comprising a wide variety of questions for inclusion in tailor made survey instruments. It is anticipated that separate question baskets would be available under broad categories of event evaluation dimensions, including economic impacts, social impacts, motivation, marketing etc. The user could build their own instrument – tailored perfectly to fit their unique event.

Once data has been collected the ENCORE program will be used to input data and generate reporting output (similar to the output that exists in the current ENCORE tool). The final tier of the website would be a data collection point, providing a valuable resource for academics, STOs and NTOs who could use this data to gain a broad-based understanding of industry impacts.

Data Collection/Input Technologies

According to the Industry Reference Group, many piles of questionnaires are currently gathering dust in the offices of event managers who have failed to progress beyond the data collection stage. We recommend investigation be made into the feasibility of incorporating a variety of data collection techniques (e.g. PDAs, mobile phone technologies, online survey software) into the new package. Questionnaire instruments which
have been created in the new tool need to be able to be imported to such devices, and data from the devices back into the tool. This has the benefit of allowing the electronic collection of data which can be exported back into the program, eliminating the time-consuming step of data entry.

Training and Support

Training and support will be vital to the success of any new tool.

A key complaint from users of ENCORE was the lack of training provided. The majority of users were not comfortable with using a manual to train themselves. They felt they needed person to person training. It is therefore recommended that face to face training will be necessary for the majority of users, especially where they have little skill or experience in research and event evaluation. An online tutorial may not suffice for this group of users.

It is recommended that online tutorials be available in addition to face to face training options, targeted to users who do have previous experience with research and a strong grasp of methodology.

It is also recommended that ongoing telephone and/or face to face support be made available for the product to answer user questions and provide other assistance or guidance for evaluations.

Without effective post sales support and appropriate demonstrations of how the software operates, there is little chance that products like ENCORE will be effective in the market.

This project identified that there are problems in the events industry in terms of the use of sound research methodology. One of the problem areas identified was bias in sampling. We recommend that the revised ENCORE tool include instruction in representative data collection. Instruction in sampling would also need to form part of face to face training. The following instruction is provided as an example of possible content for an online tutorial on appropriate sampling technique.

In order to achieve a representative sample of the population being surveyed for event evaluation purposes it is necessary to ensure that the sample is selected in an unbiased manner. The absence of bias is achieved through use of a random sampling process. Researchers need to ensure that everyone in their target population has an equal chance of being included in the sample. Care needs to be taken that no group is more or less likely to be interviewed. For example, if a resident survey is being conducted on a weekday between the hours of 9am and 6pm it is likely that people in full time employment will be underrepresented in the survey. An example of an appropriate technique of sampling for an attendee survey might be to interview every fifth person past a point or to have interviewers spread throughout the event area and conducting interviews at different times of the day.

Further Testing

While much of the default questionnaire content has been field tested as part of this study, we recommend that further development of the new tool involve extensive field testing, particularly among less experienced researchers, to ensure its usability in the event marketplace. Web design and other features are in the concept phase, yet to be tested in the marketplace. This was outside of the scope of this project. Recommendations on web design and features are included as a guideline only for stage two of the project.
APPENDIX A: WEBSITE DESIGN AND CONTENT

Web design and associated features are in the concept phase only. Further research and testing in the field will be required before implementation is considered. This was outside of the scope of stage one of the project. Recommendations on web design and features are included below as a guideline for stage two of the project. A graphic model of the proposed web design can be found on page 17.

Tier 1: Introduction Page

Event evaluation is critical to the event management planning process. It enables event managers to evaluate their event in relation to the goals and objectives set at the beginning of the planning process. It provides evidence of outcomes to report to key stakeholders. It provides benchmarks from which to measure the success (or otherwise) of your event. These can be in relation to past performances of your event or to other similar events. Event evaluation is the key to continuous improvement of an event.

The (name of new tool) will streamline the process of event evaluation for you. A few simple steps will produce a questionnaire template tailored to your specific needs. Choose from a selection of data collection and entry methods and (name of new tool) will produce the information you need to report to your stakeholders, benchmark your event, and begin the planning process for future events.

To begin the process please provide the following information.

Tier 2: Event Profile

It is proposed that there could be a series of mandatory questions to permit comparisons by type of event, location, ownership etc. This would facilitate the building of a database of information which could be used by STO’s, NTO’s and academics to gain a broader understanding of overall industry impacts, which might influence future planning.

Suggested mandatory items include:

- Event name and location
- Event timing (start and end dates; or length in days)
- Ownership: private; not-for-profit; government/public; mixed; other
- Periodic or one-time only?
- Age and continuity: year first started/held; number of years run
- Main programme features: live music/concert; dance; other performing arts; visual art; demonstrations for educational purposes; participatory recreational games; food for sale or taste; alcoholic beverages for sale or taste; competitive sport; parade; art exhibitions; exhibitions or demonstrations by commercial sponsors; meeting; convention; trade show; consumer show etc.
- Staff: number of full and part-time all-year; number of full and part-time during event
- Volunteers: number of full and part-time all year and at event only
- Type of event: open-gate, free to everyone, no attendance count; closed-gate, ticketed; attendance counted accurately; registered guests/teams/organisations only; closed-gate, attendance known; profiles of guests known
- Attendance estimate: number of paid admissions (sale of tickets); number of teams registered; number of guests through the gate

Optional questions might include:

- Venues used: streets; public parks and other outdoor spaces; public or private indoor theatres/concert halls; convention centre; exhibition centre; other
- Governance: elected or appointed board of directors; owners; CEO/professional managers; standing committees
- Volunteer roles: sit on board; chair committees; operations only
- Fees charged for entrance? Free entry? Mixture?
- Tickets sold? Tours sold? Packages sold?
• Revenue sources and % from each: commercial sponsors; ticket sales; donations; grants from the public sector (local, state, commonwealth); merchandise sales; food/beverage sales; rental fees from concessions; other
• Expense categories and % of each: artist/performer fees; costs associated with artists/performers; staff wages; volunteer costs; public services (police, fire, etc.); private security; light and sound; construction; rents paid; royalties paid; overhead/administration; other
• Professionalism: run by permanent, professional manager(s); belongs to event association; has a strategic plan; has a business plan; has a risk/safety/security management strategy; conducts regular evaluation of staff/volunteers, visitor satisfaction, stakeholder satisfaction/feedback; consults the public; has undertaken formal benchmarking against other events; has an environmental or green strategy and practices in place; has conducted an economic impact assessment
• Marketing orientation: has a marketing plan; targets specific segments; targets tourists from outside the region; does regular customer research; aims to make a profit or surplus; measures supply and demand; evaluates their competitive position (SWOT etc.); has a title sponsor; has major financial sponsors; has a media sponsor
• Communications mix: uses paid advertising; which media?
• Ownership: of land; buildings; equipment?

Tier 3: Establishing Information Needs
Tier 3 will present users with a series of questions designed to determine their evaluation needs. Questions might include:
1. Who are our attendees and where do they come from? Are our attendees satisfied with the event?
2. What is the direct in-scope expenditure or ‘new money’ our event has attracted to the region and/or State?
3. Is our event having positive and/or negative impacts on the host community?
4. How well are we doing in terms of our environmental impacts?

Tier 4: Default Option or Build Own Instrument
Based on Tier 3 choices, users will be initially directed to ready to use instruments (see Appendix C). For example, if option 1) is chosen from the tier 3 list the user should be directed to the Simple Attendee Survey. Option 2) is linked to the Comprehensive Attendee Survey, option 3) to the Host Community Social Impacts survey, and option 4) to the environmental impacts checklist. The user will consider the default option and either choose it or opt to build their own instrument. If they opt to build their own instrument they will be directed to the appropriate ‘basket’ of questions.

Tier 5: Question Baskets
It is proposed that question baskets will be available to users who wish to build their own tailor made questionnaire. The question baskets will include a wide variety of questions for inclusion in tailor made survey instruments. It is anticipated that separate question baskets might be available under broad categories of event evaluation dimensions, including economic impacts, social impacts, environmental impacts, visitor profile and demographics; motivation, marketing etc. Question baskets could continue to be built over time as new areas of event evaluation are developed.

Within each of the question baskets, there could be sub sets of questions that can be directed towards different stakeholder groups including the host community, organisers, attendees, competitors, participants, exhibitors, sponsors etc.

It is suggested that individual questions be designated as mandatory (M) or optional (O). The inclusion of mandatory questions will allow for benchmarking and meta-analysis.
Tier 6: Data Entry

We recommend investigation be made into the feasibility of incorporating a variety of data collection techniques (e.g. PDAs, mobile phone technologies, online survey software) into the new package. Questionnaire instruments which have been created in the new tool need to be able to be imported to such devices, and data from the devices back into the tool. This has the benefit of allowing the electronic collection of data which can be exported back into the program, eliminating the time-consuming step of data entry.

Tier 7: Reports

The tool will allow users to generate a wide range of tabular and graphical reports (consistent with the current tool). Users should have appropriate choice of graph/table types, size, styles and colours, the option to add accompanying text and to transport the output to Microsoft word.

Tier 8: Data Store

It is envisaged that this section of the tool will be the repository of all data collected. This repository could be used to benchmark events by event profile, and to create a broad-based profile of the events industry.
APPENDIX C: DEFAULT OPTION INSTRUMENTS

Default Instrument 1: Simple Attendee Survey

The simple attendee survey is recommended as a straightforward tool to allow the collection of basic visitation data from event attendees. It is designed as a short survey (maximum 2 pages), that should take most attendees only a few minutes to complete. The questions are not complex and should not require explanation, making the simple attendee survey appropriate for self-completion by attendees. This questionnaire has been designed to meet the needs of organisers of small and/or community events. The resources required to use this tool are minimal and should not be beyond the scope of any user. The simple attendee survey includes demographic, marketing, motivation and satisfaction questions. Expenditure questions are not part of this questionnaire.

Thank you for attending the [name of event]. Please take a few minutes to complete the following survey. Your feedback will greatly assist in future event planning.

Where is your usual place of residence?
- I live in [name of local area]
- I live in [name of state], but outside of [name of local area] – Postcode? _______
- International – Which Country? ____________________

* Is this the first time you have visited [name of local area]? **Locals do not answer**
- Yes
- No

* Did you travel to [name of local area] specifically for the [name of event]? **Locals do not answer**
- Yes
- No, I was visiting [name of local area] anyway

Have you previously been to [name of event]?
- Yes $\rightarrow$ How many times? _______
- No

How many days will you/did you attend [name of event]? _______

How many people are you attending [name of event] with? _______ (remember to include yourself)

* How many nights are you staying in [name of local area] during this visit? _______ **Locals do not answer**

How did you receive information about [name of event] this year? (Tick as many as apply.)

- Internet
- Magazine advertising or articles
- Radio programs or advertising
- Festival program or brochures
- Prior knowledge
- TV programs or advertising
- Newspaper advertising or articles
- Newsletters or other subscription material
- Word of mouth
- Other ____________________
What did you enjoy most about [name of event]?

What improvements or additional things would have made your visit to the [name of event] more enjoyable?

For each of the motivations below please rate their importance on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Unimportant and 5 = Very Important in terms of motivating you to attend [name of event]. Please place a tick in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of Little Importance</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To see the entertainment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To socialise with friends or family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet new people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be with people of similar interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience new and different things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To escape from the everyday routine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any other motivations you had for attending [name of event]?

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Very Unlikely and 5 = Very Likely, how likely are you to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend [name of event] in future years?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend [name of event] to friends and family?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Visit [name of local area] again in the future at some other time of the year (i.e. not for the event)? Locals do not answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And finally, a few questions about you…

Age bracket:
- □ 18-24 years
- □ 25-34 years
- □ 35-44 years
- □ 45-54 years
- □ 55-64 years
- □ 65+

Sex:
- □ Male
- □ Female

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire.
Default Instrument 2: Comprehensive Attendee Survey

In addition to the basic visitation data collected through the simple attendee survey, this questionnaire goes further to include the collection of expenditure data necessary to for the calculation of inscope expenditure resulting from the event. Recommended use when:

- A calculation of the direct inscope expenditure of an event is required. This also requires the collection of organiser economic data.
- Resources must be available for the questionnaires to be administered by trained interviewers – self completion of the comprehensive attendee survey is not advised.

Thank you for attending the [name of event]. Please take a few minutes to complete the following survey. Your feedback will greatly assist in future event planning.

Where is your usual place of residence?

- I live in [name of local area]
- I live in [name of state], but outside of [name of local area] – Postcode? _______
- International – Which Country? ____________________

* Is this the first time you have visited [name of local area]? **Locals do not answer**

- Yes
- No

* Did you travel to [name of local area] specifically for the [name of event]? **Locals do not answer**

- Yes
- No, I was visiting [name of local area] anyway

If you were visiting [name of local area] anyway did you:

a. Change the timing of your trip to coincide with the [name of event]?

- Yes
- No

b. Extend your stay to attend the [name of event]?

- Yes → How many more nights did you stay? ____
- No

Have you previously been to [name of event]?

- Yes → How many times? __
- No

How many days will you/did you attend [name of event]? ________

How many people are you attending [name of event] with? ________ (remember to include yourself)
*What type of accommodation are you using during your stay? *Locals do not answer

- None, I am visiting [name of local area] for the day only
- Own property in the area
- Motel
- Hotel
- Friend/ Relative’s House
- Caravan park
- Bed & Breakfast
- Other: ___________________________

* How many nights are you staying during this visit? ________ *Locals do not answer

* Are you staying any additional nights elsewhere in [name of state] during this visit? *Only interstate and international visitors to answer

- Yes → How many nights? ____
- No

How did you receive information about [name of event] this year? (Tick as many as apply.)

- Internet
- Magazine advertising or articles
- Radio programs or advertising
- Event program or brochures
- Prior knowledge
- Other ___________________________

TV programs or advertising
Newspaper advertising or articles
Newsletters or other subscription material
Word of mouth
Other ___________________________

What form of transport did you use to travel to [name of local area] for [name of event]? What forms of local transport have you used since you arrived in [name of local area]? Please tick all appropriate boxes for each column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Travel TO [name of local area]</th>
<th>Travel WITHIN [name of local area]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locals do not answer</td>
<td>All to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic flight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International flight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large car – 4WD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorbike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What did you enjoy most about [name of event]?

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
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What improvements or additional things would have made your visit to the [name of event] more enjoyable?

For each of the motivations below please rate their importance on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Unimportant and 5 = Very Important in terms of motivating you to attend [name of event]. Please place a tick in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of Little Importance</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To see the entertainment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To socialise with friends or family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet new people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be with people of similar interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience new and different things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To escape from the everyday routine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any other motivations you had for attending [name of event]?

*The questions below are about your expenditure in [name of local area] as well as [name of state] during this visit. Please include all spending made by you or likely to be made by you and your travel party. Remember to include all payments made by cash, credit cards, eftpos, cheque or travellers cheque. Include your best estimates if you are unsure of exact amounts.

Can you please tell me how much money, you and your travel party spent in total on…………

Locals do not answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure in [name of local area]</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation (including any meals and drinks where you are staying and any amounts prepaid as part of a package)</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals, food and drinks (apart from any you included in your accommodation)</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Tickets (include advance bookings)</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Entertainment Costs (eg. If going to other tourist attractions not connected to [name of festival] eg. Museum)</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (e.g. Taxi fares, petrol, vehicle repairs, car hire)</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services (eg. Hairdressing, laundry, medical)</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
<td>$A………..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any other expenditure (eg. Films, gifts, books, wine, souvenirs, clothing, toiletries) $A……… $A………

How many people does this expenditure cover? (Remember to include yourself)
Adults: _________________ Children: ____________

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Very Unlikely and 5 = Very Likely, how likely are you to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend [name of event] in future years?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend [name of event] to friends and family?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Visit [name of local area] again in the future at some other time of the year (i.e. not for the event)? <em>Locals do not answer</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And finally, a few questions about you…

Please indicate your age:

☐ 18-24 years  ☐ 25-34 years  ☐ 35-44 years  ☐ 45-54 years  ☐ 55-64 years  ☐ 65+

Sex:
☐ Male  ☐ Female

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire.
Default Instrument 3: Host Community Social Impacts Survey

The host community social impacts survey will provide users with insight and evidence of the host community’s perceptions of the social impacts of an event. The questionnaire allows residents to comment not only on the occurrence of a range of social impacts, but also how they feel about such outcomes, answering on a scale ranging from a very negative outcome, through to a very positive outcome, with a neutral midpoint. Also included are some basic demographics and questions on the level of interest and involvement in the event by residents.

This questionnaire seeks your opinions on a range of social impacts that may have resulted from the hosting of the [Event Name]. All information will be treated in strict confidence and will only be used in combination with other responses from the community.

SECTION A:

Were you aware that [Event Name] was held a few weeks ago (insert event dates)?

☐ Yes
☐ No (if no, thank and discontinue)

When you think of [Event Name], what words first come to your mind?

________________________________________

What do you think were the most positive impacts of [Event Name]?

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

What do you think were the most negative impacts of [Event Name]?

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
SECTION B:

This section seeks your opinions on the social impacts of [Event Name] on your community. Please read the statements on the following pages and indicate, in your opinion, if they occurred as a result of [Event Name], and how you feel about these outcomes. Each statement asks for your opinion, and as such, it is important to note that there are no right or wrong answers.

Please respond to the questions on the following pages by:

a) Answering if the stated impact occurred as a result of [Event Name], by circling YES, NO or DON’T KNOW.

and

b) If you answer either YES or NO, please indicate on the scale from -3 to +3 how you feel about that outcome, where -3 represents a very negative outcome, +3 represents a very positive outcome and 0 represents a neutral outcome.

c) If you answer DON’T KNOW, please move directly to the next statement.

EXAMPLES:

Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Did this occur?</th>
<th>How do you feel about this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The festival makes life in my community more interesting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Did this occur?</th>
<th>How do you feel about this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The festival brings in money for my community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The -3 to +3 scale represents the following values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEGATIVE EFFECT</th>
<th>POSITIVE EFFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a Very Negative Outcome</td>
<td>This is a Very Positive Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a Neutral Outcome</td>
<td>This is a Neutral Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a Neutral Outcome</td>
<td>This is a Very Positive Outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the above instructions please complete the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Did this occur?</th>
<th>How do you feel about this?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Very Negative Outcome</td>
<td>A Neutral Outcome</td>
<td>A Very Positive Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) The festival led to increased traffic in my community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The festival led to difficulty finding car parking in my community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The festival led to increased noise in the area surrounding the festival venues</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) The festival led to increased litter in the areas surrounding festival venues</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) The festival led to crowding of public spaces and facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) The festival promotes the development and/or maintenance of public facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) The festival disrupted the normal routines of local residents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) The festival provided entertainment opportunities for the local community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) The festival provided opportunities for shared experiences with friends and/or family</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) The festival provided opportunities to meet new people from outside the community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) The festival increased the pride of local residents in their town</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) The festival enhanced residents’ sense of community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) The festival enhances the town’s reputation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statement</th>
<th>Did this occur?</th>
<th>How do you feel about this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Very Negative Outcome</td>
<td>A Neutral Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) The festival encourages future tourism</td>
<td>Yes No Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) The staging of the festival utilised local resources and skills</td>
<td>Yes No Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p) The festival generates increased spending in our community</td>
<td>Yes No Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q) The festival stimulates employment opportunities for residents</td>
<td>Yes No Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r) The festival encouraged increased rowdy and/or delinquent behaviour</td>
<td>Yes No Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s) The festival encouraged excessive drinking and/or drug use</td>
<td>Yes No Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t) The festival led to increases in the price of some goods and services</td>
<td>Yes No Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u) The festival led to increases in local property values and/or rental costs</td>
<td>Yes No Don’t Know</td>
<td>-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any other impacts, not identified above, that [Event Name] had on you or your community? (Please describe).

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
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SECTION C:

This final section asks a series of questions about your involvement with [Event Name] and concludes with some demographic information.

Did you attend [Event Name] this year?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

Have you attended [Event Name] in previous years?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

Did you volunteer at [Event Name] this year?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

Have you ever previously volunteered at [Event Name]?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

Did you undertake any paid work during the period of [Event Name]?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

IF YES, did your normal employment hours increase as a result of event trade?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

Did you have any other form of involvement or participation in [Event Name]? Please describe.

________________________________________________________________________

Please tick the box next to the statement that most accurately reflects how you feel about [Event Name]. (Please tick only one box.)

[ ] I love [Event Name] and hope it continues.

[ ] I tolerate [Event Name] and the inconveniences associated with it because overall I think it is good for the community.

[ ] I have to adjust my lifestyle to avoid the inconveniences associated with [Event Name].

[ ] I stay away from the area during [Event Name] because I dislike the inconveniences associated with it.

[ ] I dislike [Event Name] and would be happier if it didn’t continue in future years.

[ ] I have no involvement with [Event Name] and no opinion on it.

Sex:  [ ] Male  [ ] Female

In which year were you born? __________

How many years have you lived in [name of town]? (to the nearest year) ________

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire.
Default Instrument 4: Organiser Economic Survey

In order to estimate the total in-scope expenditure, or ‘new money’ that an event has attracted to your region and/or State, it is necessary to determine the contribution by the event organiser as well as event attendees.

The following survey collects organiser data on income and expenditure, as well as estimated population information. The survey asks for estimates of the percentage of each income and expenditure category that is received from outside the region/State, that is, the funds received from parties outside the region/State in which the event is being staged.

This data is used in conjunction with attendee data, such as their place of origin, primary purpose of visit, as well as their expenditure.

1. **Which of the following groups did you survey at [Event Name]? (Tick all that apply)**

   - [ ] Attendees
   - [ ] Exhibitors
   - [ ] Competitors
   - [ ] Participants
   - [ ] Other (please specify): __________________

2. **For the relevant groups you surveyed at [Event Name], please provide an estimate of the population*.**

   Attendees: ________
   Exhibitors: ________
   Competitors: ________
   Participants: ________
   Other: ________

* Population estimates are only required for attendee groups where separate surveys were administered. Thus, if only attendees were surveyed, population estimates are not required for competitors or exhibitors, as it is assumed all attendees were included under the ‘attendees’ category.

**Important:**

- In estimating the population of attendees, it is important to record the number of attendees at the event as a whole, rather than attendances, which may result in the double counting of an individual who makes multiple visits to an event.
- While the estimated number of attendees and competitors/participants relate to individuals, the estimated population of exhibitors refers to companies or organisations.

3. **Please provide a brief explanation of how you obtained the above population estimates.**

____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
4. What forms of income were generated from [Event Name]?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME TYPE</th>
<th>GROSS EVENT INCOME $</th>
<th>REGIONAL INCOME</th>
<th>STATE (TERRITORY) INCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside Region $</td>
<td>Outside Region %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Total Income Within the Region $</td>
<td>Total Income From Within the State $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Income items will often be specific to an individual festival/event. Typical income items include: ticket sales, sponsorships, government grants and prizes, and merchandise sales.
5. What expenses were incurred as a result of staging [Event Name]?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSE TYPE</th>
<th>GROSS EVENT EXPENSES $</th>
<th>REGIONAL EXPENSES</th>
<th>STATE (TERRITORY) EXPENSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside Region %</td>
<td>Outside Region $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Expenditure External to Region $  
Total Expenditure External to State $  
Grand Total $  
Total Expenditure Within the Region $  
Total Expenditure Within the State $  

Note: Expenditure items will often be specific to an individual festival/event. Typical expenditure items include: performer fees, construction/hire costs, marketing, salary/wages, travel costs, administration fees, and prizes.
Default Instrument 5: Organiser Environmental Impact Checklist

The Environmental Impact Checklist is a practical self evaluation tool for event organisers concerned with managing the environmental impacts of their event in areas such as event planning; venue and site selection; promotions, merchandising and education; water; waste; energy; catering; accommodation; travel and transport.

The following survey collects organiser data on sustainable event practices and provides insight into the impacts an event is having on the environment.

How to use the checklist:

Stage 1 – Checklist

• Stage 1 comprises nine categories (event planning; venue and site selection; promotions, merchandising and education; water; waste; energy; catering; accommodation; travel and transport) in which you can choose to evaluate your event’s performance. Your first step is to select the categories that are relevant to your event. If, for example, catering is not relevant to your event, then you would not select this category.
• For your selected categories you should answer all included questions. There is a 'Not Applicable' (N/A) response available for any questions within your selected categories that may not be relevant to your event.

Stage 2 – Measurement (optional)

• Stage 2 is provided as an optional add-on to the checklist.
• Stage 2 is only relevant for events that wish to monitor their performance in the key impact areas of energy, water, waste, and travel and transport. An event needs to have measured their impacts in one or more of the above areas, for example, their energy or water usage.
• The recording of simple measures in these areas (e.g. kilograms of waste to landfill; litres of water consumed) will allow events to benchmark against themselves and monitor their environmental performance over the years.
STAGE 1 – CHECKLIST

1. Event Planning

Do you want to evaluate your environmental performance in the category of Event Planning?

☐ Yes → Continue
☐ No → Move onto Category 2
☐ N/A → Move onto Category 2

a. Did you prepare a written environmental policy for your event which can be shared with all stakeholders?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

b. Did you look at past event energy use, wastage and other environmental impacts and find ways of reducing this?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

c. Did you estimate the total carbon footprint of your event?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

d. Did you offset the carbon emissions produced at the event?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

2. Venue and Site Selection

Do you want to evaluate your environmental performance in the category of Venue and Site Selection?

☐ Yes → Continue
☐ No → Move onto Category 3
☐ N/A → Move onto Category 3

a. Did you plan your event precisely (looking at numbers, duration, space required etc) in order to select an appropriate venue or site to ensure minimum energy and resource use?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

b. Did you choose a venue/site site with good public transport links?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

c. Did you choose a site that is not sensitive or at risk from the event (for example, due to biodiversity or archaeological significance)?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A
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3. Promotions, Merchandising and Education

Do you want to evaluate your environmental performance in the category of Promotions, Merchandising and Education?

- [ ] Yes  → Continue
- [ ] No  → Move onto Category 4
- [ ] N/A  → Move onto Category 4

a. Did you use electronic media (websites, radio, television) as much as possible to reduce printing of promotional materials?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] N/A

d. Did you carefully estimate the quantities of printed material required so as not to over-order?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] N/A

g. Did you source merchandising and gifts made from recycled or sustainable materials?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] N/A

h. Did you promote the event’s sustainable practices, pre, during and/or post the event?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] N/A

i. Did you educate attendees about ways they can assist in reducing their environmental footprint?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] N/A
4. Catering

Do you want to evaluate your environmental performance in the category of Catering?

☐ Yes  → Continue
☐ No  → Move onto Category 5
☐ N/A  → Move onto Category 5

a. Did you use local rather than imported food and beverage where possible?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

b. Did you use Fairtrade products such as coffee, tea and sugar?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

c. Did you plan menus using in-season, fresh organic food?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

d. Did you request that caterers/vendors use washable and reusable cutlery & crockery?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

e. Did you ensure that caterers/vendors using disposable cutlery & crockery sourced biodegradable or compostable products?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

f. Did you eliminate the use of single serve water bottles?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

g. Did you supply drinking water to minimise the sale of bottles and/or encourage the use of refillable bottles?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A

5. Accommodation

Do you want to evaluate your environmental performance in the category of Accommodation?

☐ Yes  → Continue
☐ No  → Move onto Category 6
☐ N/A  → Move onto Category 6

a. Did you use or recommend accommodation within walking distance of the event site/venue?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ N/A
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b. Did you use or recommend accommodation with pro-active waste, water and energy management practices?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

6. Energy

Do you want to evaluate your environmental performance in the category of Energy?

   □ Yes → Continue
   □ No → Move onto Category 7
   □ N/A → Move onto Category 7

a. Did you use a green/renewable energy supplier/source?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

b. Did you use sustainable alternatives (such as bio fuels) over diesel and gasoline powered generators?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

c. Did you carefully plan the number, size and placement of generators based on load and usage patterns?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

d. Did you use any zero emissions solutions for your energy production, such as solar, wind, or pedal power?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

e. Did you hold the event during the day to maximise use of natural light?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

f. Did you ensure that suppliers used modern energy efficient technology?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

g. Did you use low energy lighting?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

h. Did you ensure all equipment was turned off when not in use?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

i. Did you measure your impacts? (i.e. record any figures for energy usage etc)
   □ Yes → Also Complete Stage 2 (Energy Impacts)
   □ No → Move onto Category 7
7. Travel & Transport

Do you want to evaluate your environmental performance in the category of Travel and Transport?

☐ Yes → Continue
☐ No → Move onto Category 8
☐ N/A → Move onto Category 8

a. Did you choose local contractors, vendors and/or artists to minimise transport climate impacts?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Sometimes ☐ N/A

b. Did you provide attendees, staff and volunteers with public transport information?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Sometimes ☐ N/A

c. Did you promote and/or encourage the use of public transport?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Sometimes ☐ N/A

d. Did you promote and/or encourage the use of car sharing, walking or cycling to the event?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Sometimes ☐ N/A

e. Did you run shuttle buses to and from the event site?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Sometimes ☐ N/A

f. Did you offset carbon emissions for transport where possible?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Sometimes ☐ N/A

g. Did you offer options to attendees to offset their carbon emissions for transport?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Sometimes ☐ N/A

h. Did you measure your impacts? (i.e. record any figures for travel and transport impacts etc)
  ☐ Yes → Also Complete Stage 2 (Travel and Transport Impacts)
   ☐ No → Move onto Category 8

8. Waste

Do you want to evaluate your environmental performance in the category of Waste?

☐ Yes → Continue
☐ No → Move onto Category 9
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- **N/A** → Move onto Category 9

a. Did you implement practices that focused on waste prevention and minimisation in areas such as ticketing, promotions and marketing materials, food packaging etc.
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes
   - N/A

b. Did you store any materials and/or equipment for re-use in future years?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes
   - N/A

c. Did you encourage attendees to separate waste by providing separate bin systems?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes
   - N/A

d. Did you provide recycling bins for glass, paper, plastics and other recyclable materials?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes
   - N/A

e. Did you provide compost bins for food scraps and compostable cutlery, cups etc?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes
   - N/A

f. Did you place recycling bins in high traffic areas with visible signage?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes
   - N/A

g. Did you measure your impacts? (i.e. record any figures for waste production, recycling etc)
   - Yes → Also Complete Stage 2 (Waste Impacts)
   - No → Move onto Category 9

9. **Water**

Do you want to evaluate your environmental performance in the category of Water?

- Yes → Continue
- No → You have finished completing the checklist.
- N/A → You have finished completing the checklist.

a. Did you implement a grey water treatment and re-use process?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes
   - N/A

b. Did you implement a waste water management system to ensure the correct disposal of black/brown water?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes
   - N/A

c. Did you use restricted flush or water free (e.g. composting) toilets and urinals?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes
   - N/A
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d. Did you use water saving showerheads and/or taps?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

e. Did you use motion sensor taps with an auto stop mechanism?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

f. Did you use eco-friendly or chemical free cleaning products?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Sometimes  □ N/A

g. Did you measure your impacts? (i.e. record any figures for water usage and/or production etc)
   □ Yes → Also Complete Stage 2 (Water Impacts)
   □ No → You have finished completing the checklist.
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STAGE 2 - MEASUREMENT

Energy Impacts

Please record available figures below to measure what power was consumed at your event.

1. Landline/grid power
   a. Total landline/grid power used:
      ____ kilowatt hours
      ____ kilowatt hours per person
   b. Percentage of landline/grid power from renewable sources:
      ____ %

2. Fuel usage for power generators
   a. Amount of diesel used for generators:
      ____ litres
      ____ litres per person
   b. Amount of biofuel (or other sustainable alternative) used for generators:
      ____ litres
      ____ litres per person
   c. Percentage of generators powered by sustainable alternatives (e.g. biofuel):
      ____ %

3. Zero emissions power
   a. Total zero emissions power (solar, wind, pedal power etc) used:
      ____ kilowatt hours
      ____ kilowatt hours per person

Travel and Transport Impacts

Please record available figures below to measure the travel and transport impacts of your event.

1. Travel to and from the event (attendees, artists, competitors, exhibitors, volunteers, crew etc)
   a. Distance travelled on return trip (to and from) the event for each mode of transport:
      Domestic flight:
      ____ average distance (kilometres) travelled
      ____ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person
      International flight:
      ____ average distance (kilometres) travelled
      ____ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person
      Hybrid car:
      ____ average distance (kilometres) travelled
      ____ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person
      Small car:
      ____ average distance (kilometres) travelled
      ____ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person
      Family car:
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___ average distance (kilometres) travelled
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person

Large car – 4WD:
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person

Train:
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person

Bus:
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person

b. Population using each mode of transport:

Domestic flight:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode

International flight:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode

Hybrid car:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode

Small car:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode

Family car:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode

Large car – 4WD:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode

Train:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode

Bus:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode

2. Travel to and from accommodation/residence to the event (attendees, artists, competitors, exhibitors, volunteers, crew etc)

a. Distance travelled per day on return trip (to and from) accommodation/residence to the event for each mode of transport:

Walking:
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per day
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person per day

Cycling:
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per day
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person per day

Hybrid car:
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___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per day
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person per day
Small car:
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per day
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person per day
Family car:
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per day
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person per day
Large car – 4WD:
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per day
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person per day
Train:
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per day
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person per day
Bus:
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per day
___ average distance (kilometres) travelled per person per day

b. Population using each mode of transport:
Walking:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode
Cycling:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode
Hybrid car:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode
Small car:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode
Family car:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode
Large car – 4WD:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode
Train:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode
Bus:
___ % population using transport mode
___ number of people using transport mode
Waste Impacts

Please record available figures below to measure what weight of waste was recycled, composted, or landfilled at your event.

1. Landfill
   a. Amount of waste sent to landfill:
      ____ kilograms
      ____ kilograms per person

2. Recycled
   b. Amount of waste recycled:
      ____ kilograms
      ____ kilograms per person

3. Composted
   c. Amount of waste composted:
      ____ kilograms
      ____ kilograms per person

Water Impacts

Please record available figures below to measure what amount of water was consumed, and what amount of waste water was produced at your event.

1. Water consumed
   a. Total volume of water used:
      ____ litres
      ____ litres per person

2. Waste water produced
   a. Total volume of grey water produced:
      ____ litres
      ____ litres per person

   b. Total volume of grey water treated and re-used at the event
      ____ litres
      ____ litres per person

   c. Total volume of sewage (black/brown water) produced:
      ____ litres
      ____ litres per person
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