Summary of EuroFM RNG meeting in the Hague,
12-13 February 2015

Participants: 12. February

Susanne Balslev Nielsen (chair), DTU; Knut Boge, Oslo and Akershus University College of
Applied Sciences; Jan Bröchner, Chalmers TU; Per Anker Jensen, DTU; Theo van der Voordt, Delft
TU; Ronald Beckers, HAN UAS; Tanja Zuijderwijk, Rotterdam Univ; Tore Haugen, NTNU; Antje
Junghans, NTNU; Giulia Nardelli, DTU; Keith Jones, ARU; Michael May, HTW Berlin/GEFMA; Suvi
Nenonen, Aalto Univ; Jan Gerard Hoendervanger, HAN UAS; Arrien Termaat, Saxion UAS; Annet
de Haas, FMN; Patricia McCarrol, Sheffield Hallam Univ; Ruth Pijls, Saxion UAS; Arjan van Rheed,
Haag UAS Hotelschool; Joop van Duren, Zuyd AS; Bernard Drion, NHTV Breda; Frans Melissen,
HTV Breda; Stefan Lechner, HAN UAS; Frans Joostous, Haag UAS; C.MA. (Ineke) van der Meule,
Haag UAS; Rachel Kuijlenberg, Haag UAS; Henk W. Brink, HAN UAS; Mark P. Mobach, HAN
UAS/Wageningen UR/Haag UAS.
Referent: Knut Boge

Agenda: Meeting the Dutch FM researchers

Mark Mobach, PhD, Hanze UAS/Wageningen UR –moderator/intro.
Gave an overview of the most important ongoing FM research projects in the Netherlands.
Some of these (all or parts of them) projects were later presented for RNG by the researchers.

Henk Brink, MSc, Hanze UAS – The Quality and Experience of the Indoor Climate with
Professional Buildings

Frans Joostens (and Lura Itard) – Building Management for a good indoor climate and
low energy use
Research project because 70 per cent of the users are not satisfied with indoor climate. Poor
indoor climate affect absenteeism. This research has been carried out by students at Haag
UAS. Facility Managers delegate too much responsibility to technical staff. Indoor climate is
measureable. Many (new) building deny the users personal control (opening of windows,
etc.). This project address the users’ perception of indoor climate vs. measureable facts.
There are some “killer variables” for productivity (air quality, temperature, etc.). The comfort
zone is usually 18-23 degrees C. Coordinating user experiences (client management, product
management, performance contracts, SLA/PLA and monitoring). The Facility Manager has to
be responsible for indoor climate.
Questions: Personal control/lack of such. How to measure productivity (the students measure perceived productivity)?

**Henk W. Brink – Comfort index Professional Office Buildings.**
Working with first year students
Part of research group headed by Mark Mobach. The research group developed a model for involvement of the students in applied research (Researchers, teachers, Honour students and ordinary BA-students). The research group has also changed the instruments for measuring perceived and actual indoor climate. Honour and senior students are also used as teaching assistants. This project has so far involved 300 students from Hanze and 200 from the Hague. There are several dimensions concerning indoor climate, such as temperature, air, noise, lighting, view, privacy. Each of these are operationalized into measureable or observable variables and testable hypotheses. Students have collected data individually concerning air quality, such as temperature, ventilation type, air condition, insulation, etc. The students have also measures the respondents’ perceived productivity. This project has usually been the students’ first real research, and participation in this research is mandatory. The organizations studied would like to know the results and what to do. Online survey: [https://survey.enalyzer.com/survey](https://survey.enalyzer.com/survey)

Questions: The students’ data are stored. CO2 – cooperation with ventilation. Delft TU has a professor in indoor climate. Why not use established indicators? Buildings do not deliver the performance calculated during design. Fanger’s equation.

**Frans Melissen, PhD, NHTV UAS Breda – Sustainable Business Models – Research Agenda**
Frans Melissen has his background in hospitality and tourism rather than FM. He has an MSc in industrial engineering and management science – organisational psychology from Eindhoven TU. His PhD was about collection system for consumer electronics (avoiding pollution from heavy metals). He has now become Professor of Sustainable Business models at NHTV Breda. He has a past as an active (applied) researcher in tourism, hospitality and environmental science, and also partly an activist. He had a project with ISS for a labelling system about sustainability (the labelling system was not realized).

NHTV Breda consists of 5 academies, 7000 students, 700 staff. There is an academy for Hotel and Facility Management (More HM than FM). INHTV Breda has increased the number of publications during the last years, and the research generate more money than anticipated. So far they have not been so successful with regard to external financing (EU, etc.). NHTV Breda has three focus areas: Sustainable business models, Hospitality experiences and consumer behaviour, and Educational scholarship for HM and FM (knowledge building linked to life long learning, executive education, etc.).

NHTV Breda has a research group for Sustainable Business Models (Frans, Ko, Jön, Maartje, Lieke). This research group is linked with other professorships at NHTV. (tourism, logistics, ethics), and CELTH (task force for sustainability), hotel/hospitality and FM.

Sustainable business models are one of Frans Melissen’s research areas (sharing economy, sustainable cities, social innovation and ethics). The area of interest is second wave of
sustainable business models (licence to operate now vs. licence to operate in the long run). These models include among others honour, morality, trust, virtues, etc. Frans Melissen has some FM-specific ideas: How to move beyond labels, certification schemes, recycling and saving energy (servicization, sharing economy principles), Added value FM for sustainable development (more than money/monetary terms). Frans Melissen is very interested in cooperation. E-mail: melissen.f@nhtv.nl

Questions: How to behave – and how to understand that humans are part of a bigger system? Sustainable business models are business models in the broad sense.

Rachel Kuijlenberg, BSc, Hague UAS – Captured vs. Capturing – The Influence of Facility Management on Detainees
Lecturer in FM at Hague UAS. Recently nominated as the best lecturer in NL.

Rachel Kuijlenberg has been doing research in prisons during the last two years. Punishment = deprivation of civil rights. The Dutch prison system includes: 77 locations, 15,000 employees, 60,000 "guests", hereunder 30,000 only for one month. The average "stay" is 105 days. 1 day of detention = 262 Euro. Most prisoners are "frequent customers" (inside again after a few months). A typical Dutch cell is 10 square meter. The norm earlier was single cells (18 hours per day). There are now often two inmates per cell. Lunch 1130. 40 minutes of fresh air per day.

Rachel Kuijlenberg do research with the students (brings the FM-students to the prisons). She also do research about food in prisons. Sodexo provides the food in Hague’s prison. The prisoners provide the food in some of the other prisons. How does the architecture affect the prisoners? Is the architecture part of the punishment? There is lack of privacy. What are the relation between living conditions/well being and (violent/anti-social) behaviour? Research indicates that well considered facilities have a positive influence on the inmates’ well-being and behaviour.

Question: Rehabilitation? The Dutch prison regime has become considerably stricter during the last 10 years.

Joop van Duren, PhD, Zuyd UAS professor in Facility Mgt – Facility Management – Focusing of Facility Control
Professor in FM from 1 March 2015. FM for stakeholders, “fit for use” – people, place, process (FM, REM, Facility control).

The concept of Facility Control is borrowed from ICT. Matrix: aim, arrange, perform vs. business, control, Facility operations. FM and RE policies are supposed to support business (Business, demand, supply and delivery).

Research areas: Challenges for Zuyd’s region linked to Zuyd’s strategic topics (sustainable build environment, innovative technology and care, and new materials and life science). The vacancy rate for RE in Zuyd’a area is 20% (health care, shops, real estate, etc.). This vacancy rate affects the “liveability” in neighbourhoods (shops closes, neighbours leave, aging people living at home, cooperation in neighbourhoods, etc.).
Way of working: Broad research group/broad cooperation (within Zuyd, in municipalities, service organizations, volunteers, co-operations for social housing, other professorships, etc.).

Other ingredients in the research: Value based procurements, relational contracts (instead of classical contracts), involvement of all stakeholders, development of new economic models, multi-and interdisciplinary approaches, etc.

Questions/feedback: 20% vacancy for the RE must affect social cohesion and the social fabric and resilience. Must look behind the economic factors and causes. Have to demolish real estate. New economic models? Not all services can be provided on a commercial basis. Take the clients and providers into consideration. Delft TU has a long research tradition with regard to built environment and empty buildings (even an area at Saxion). How can municipalities reorganize their real estate organizations? Centralization vs. decentralization (and the governance levels). Demographic decline (already a fact in Scandinavia). Smart cities? A complex process – many phenomenon happening at the same time (industrial decline, mining industry disappearing, economic decline, aging, secularisation, new ways of working, poor public sector, online shopping, etc.).

Ruth Pijls, MSc, Saxion UAS – Experiencing Hospitality – Preliminary Results of a Qualitative Study on the Experience of Hospitality in Facility Management.

PhD project. Started a year ago. What do we experience when the experience is hospitality? The study objects are consumer perspective in a service context, hereunder hospitality and sensory perception. Dimensions of experiences of hospitality: Sensory perception and processing – functional, mechanical and humanistic clues (ambient factors, design factors and social factors). Service cues (Berry, Wall and Carbone 2006). Environmental features (Baker 1987).

Literature study about hospitality. Delphi study (n = 8) and consumers interviews and storytelling (n = 60). A quantitative study after the qualitative study to validate the results. Individual perspective (host and guest perspective – what is hospitable behaviour and how do we as a guest perceive that?). There is limited research about this area (articles, empirical research and theoretical framework) seen from the guest’s perspective. The existing literature about hospitality experience usually discuss safety, comfort, welcoming, friendliness, warmth, pleasure, pleasantness, willingness to help others, empathy, etc.

The Delphi study was based on use of experts from different areas (hotels, gastronomy, healthcare, business, entertainment, architecture, travel). 3 rounds with experts (face-to-face interviews, feedback on results and panel discussion). The Delphi process reduced the number of dimensions from 5 to 4 (personal attention = core – expressed in these dimensions: servitude, warm welcome, safety and empathy (pleasure), and recognition of the guests through acknowledgement, control and surprise/exceeding expectations (necessary for hospitality)). What is important of these dimensions vary with context (Dependent variables). The independent variables are the factors.

Cases: Het Concert Gebouw, NH Hotels, ABN Amro, Monuta, NS and Deventer hospital. The aim now is to develop measurement instrument.

Now laboratory experiments to identify services cues, such as hospitable lighting (brightness, colour, distribution in the room and dynamics of the lighting), hospitable reception (real vs.
virtual hosts) and service cues like sound, scent/smell, etc. Identify the role of service cues, types of guests (ages, moods) and moment in the delivery of the service process.

Questions/comments: The dimensions found through the Delphi studies - Is there a hierarchy for the dimensions (warm welcome before attention, etc.)? Are there cultural differences? Do people react different depending on their cultural background? Have to control for culture if culture is not included in the study. Surprise (experience economy). Would not like surprises at Holiday Inn. Statistics? Can the context change the respondents’ measurement or perception of a situation? More to do on the conceptual than on the empirical level? Can Tripadvisor and similar systems be used as data sources? Robot and self service systems with regard to hospitality? How do we perceive hospitality when we do the job ourselves? Access-economy as an extension of experience economy?
EuroFM RNG-meeting day 2 – Friday 13 February 2015

Participants:

Susanne Balslev Nielsen (chair), DTU; Knut Boge, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences; Jan Bröchner, Chalmers TU; Per Anker Jensen, DTU; Theo van der Voordt, Delft TU; Tore Haugen, NTNU; Antje Junghans, NTNU; Giulia Nardelli, DTU; Keith Jones, ARU; Michael May, HTW Berlin/GEFMA; Suvi Nenonen, Aalto Univ; Patricia McCarrol, Sheffield Hallam Univ; Mark P. Mobach, HAN UAS/Wageningen UR; Brenda Groen, Saxion UAS; Alexander Redlein, Vienna TU; Sergio Vega, UPM.

Referent: Knut Boge

Part 1
General information:

- Keith Alexander will continue preparations for the research tracks of EFMC2015 (People make Facilities Management) in Glasgow 1-3 June (1 day (RNG)+2 days (EFMC)).
  - 50 papers (35 accepted) – deadline for finished papers is 16 February. There are 61 authors, 35 presentations, 17 sessions.
  - Online publication edited by Keith Alexander and Ilfryn Price (3 lead paper, 28 refereed papers and 5 work in progress)
  - RNG Research workshops 1 June at Strathclyde University Technology and Innovation Centre (4 sessions) (promised included in the program according to Keith Alexander)
  - Day 2 (8 session, 23 papers) and day 3 (4 sessions, 12 papers).
  - Best paper award (Originality, relevance and quality). Ranking by scientific committee (top 9 papers by track chairs and moderators, shortlist of 3 papers). Need for a jury to BPA and poster competitions.

- Discussion about EFMC’s business model where the industry and practice are supposed to meet the scientists. There are two alternatives for future conferences, either more research (traditional conference) or to continue the current combination at EFMC (mixed model). Conferences are a place to exchange views and ideas and to become energized. It is possible to lower the price for the conference if everyone pays. The prices can be differentiated – but everyone should pay. Content vs. style. The RNG also consider 3 days to be a long time. It is better with 2 days (and more parallel sessions). A shorter EFMC conference may increase the participation.

- The Post graduate network (Giulia Nardelli) would like to be in the same rooms as RNG and should be included in the main program. But the PGN would also like to have the opportunity to meet at the conference (after the official program).

- EuroFM is negotiating a new contract for EFMC2016 and further, which gives RNG together with the other network groups, a new possibility to rethink the conference’s format. When will this be discussed? E.g. at the next RNG meeting in Glasgow.
Issues where actions are needed (and where we can make decisions):

- New chair of WG Sustainability in FM: Antje Junghans, NTNU. Congratulations.
- New communication coordinators: Successor of Pieter (no time because of new tasks).
  - Michael May volunteered for the position as the RNG’s coordinator for EFMI (4 issues per year). MM needs contribution from each WG and reports about other interesting projects. It is a good idea to make an annual plan for contributions to EFMI (October meeting). Ideas for articles to EFMI are among others about own research and promising master projects. (SBN and MM draft a plan with the deadlines in consideration – have to be coordinated with Pieter’s plans).
  - We are now encouraged to upload articles and papers to EuroFM’s knowledge portal. Benefit: dissemination/membership. SBN considers this webpage as a channel for publication of popular articles and EFMC papers (SBN consider copyrights not to be a problem since the EFMC papers are made for EuroFM). This is not a channel for the academic articles (except for earlier EFMC articles) because of the main target group: FM practitioners. SBN assumes that internal in RNG we are more likely to use e.g. Google scholar and Research gate.
    - We should publish the same papers on EuroFM’s knowledge portal as on Research Gate (dual publication).
    - RNG strategy for the knowledge portal: Conference papers, FM, popular articles, reports.
- Candidates for researcher of the year – process 2015-2016
  - The deadline is 27 February 2015. KA has probably started the process.
    Nominations before the deadline (Criteria are on the website). Same procedure as last year. Possible change of format for 2016.
- Candidates for bachelor and master student competition:
  - Master students (RNG) – process, jury and event?
  - Nominations? Deadline was 12 February. SBN takes care of this.
- Updating the RNG member database (Brenda Groen) (consisting of members and guests)
  - Forward updates of the RNG database (name, institution, e-mail address, etc.) to Brenda Groen (b.h.groen@saxion.nl)
  - The post graduate network has a DropBox account
- Next number of EFMI: Michael May is willing to replace Pieter le Roux.
  - Annual plan?
- What else will we do?
  - Wim Bakens, Secretary General of CIB invited to joint webinars (presentations of projects and things we are occupied with). Videos/lectures with short insights for inspiration. Boosting the value for our members. RNG member and CIB coordinator, Geir Hansen, NTNU could be a contact person or Keith Jones who is coordinator for CIB W70.
  - Keith Jones suggests webinars with panel discussions about FM and climate change.
Part 2 – Workshop: Draw the ideal storyboard

**Background:** one of the values for researchers in EuroFM is the contact with other FM researchers and access to dissemination channels via EuroFM. Since more research need to attract external funding, it is likely that the EuroFM secretariat ([team@office-eurofm.org](mailto:team@office-eurofm.org)) will receive a lot more requests for project collaboration; with the role of being a dissemination partner. The workshop is to discuss and draw the ideal story board for this process.

**Purpose:** Creating a shared understanding of a good process for involving EuroFM in Research applications.

Comment: Alexander Redlein informs that the process in the secretariat is to circulate any requests for research collaboration within the board before saying yes (or no).

**Two groups brainstormed.**

**Group “Theo”:** Transparency (Open member list, and more accessible database). This group would like to have a letter of support from EuroFM for use when informing the industry and clients about possible research projects/applications. Success is dependent of early action. EuroFM should support dissemination of ideas, so those in the PNC and CNGA who are interested could step forward.

**Group “Brenda”:** Who of the member companies are involved in what? Monitoring of calls for projects. Organizing response to calls (e.g. EU Horizon2020). The process should be: fun, interesting, transparent & easy; efficient/rapid; reliable and share common goals.
Discussion:

- There is a huge task to monitor EU calls or part of calls and to respond in due time.
- Could there be a new meeting structure for EuroFM? Network meetings evening day 1, and projects and ideas to be discussed during day 2 (research proposals, etc.). It takes time to approach the right persons. E.g. RNG October meeting – track for research proposals.
- It is important to bring in the small and medium size national service providers in applications (they are usually member of the national associations that are member of EuroFM).

The RNG meeting ended and during the members meeting 3 RNG members presented examples of ongoing and future research:

1) In search of the added value of FM (Per)
2) Sustainability FM - applications for EU collaborations (Sergio)
3) Workplace research (Brenda)

A story board drafted after the RNG-meeting ended which could summarise a common shared understanding of the process. This will Susanne take to the board for further discussion before next RNG meeting.