

Title: Personal control and Occupant behavior

**Chairs: Atze Boerstra, BBA Binnenmilieu + Eindhoven University of Technology (NL)
Gail Brager, Centre for the Built Environment, UC Berkeley (USA)**

Emails chairs: ab-bba@binnenmilieu.nl & gbrager@berkeley.edu

Workshop description:

The workshop is about personal control and behavioral adaptation of building occupants. The main focus is on man-environment interactions and control at room level or workstation level over thermal environment (heating, cooling) and indoor air quality (ventilation). Think: operable windows, clothing protocols, thermostats, ceiling fans, personal ventilation systems, and so forth.

The main goal of the workshop is to map what is and what is not known about personal control over indoor climate and occupant behavior and its effect on comfort, health and productivity and to identify new control related research areas.

Many studies have shown that offering the right amount of personal control over indoor climate results in less building related symptoms, more comfort and increased performance of the occupants. But what is the mechanism behind this? How does the (ab)use of building controls affect energy use? Can we achieve 100% satisfaction (PD=0%) with the right mix of controls? Is offering full control always the right solution? Or do people in some situation actually prefer central control? What is most energy efficient – automated controls or offering full control to the occupants? Is it just about controlling the indoor climate or should we also look at control over the visual and acoustic environment? What is the relation between available control, perceived control and exercised control? How about group use of operable windows, thermostats etc in open plan offices, class rooms and other larger spaces? What design criteria (limits) should be used when designing personal climatisation solutions? Are high tech personal control solutions preferred over low tech solutions like operable windows? Do we know enough about occupant behavior to predict how controls will be used in practice? What are new personal control research areas that should be addressed in the future?

Workshop format & program

This workshop will be highly INTERACTIVE. The general idea is: we bring the questions, all together generate the answers. For a further explanation about the workshop format, see the appendix (text of email about Healthy Building conference workshop formats that was sent to Lydia Morawska and Richard DeDear mid july).

Van: Atze Boerstra [mailto:ab-bba@binnenmilieu.nl]
Verzonden: woensdag 13 juli 2011 23:18
Aan: Lidia Morawska
CC: Richard de Dear
Onderwerp: RE: HB2012 - workshop format

Dear Lydia and Richard,

In reaction to your invitation to write down my ideas about workshops, here are a few suggestions:

1. I suggest that at least 75% of the workshop time is allocated for true interaction. We could decide to start the workshop with a short introductory presentation (of around 1-15 minutes) but also could start away right away with the questions.
2. The one way presentation(s) at the beginning is (are) NOT a display of the latest ideas or latest results of the intro presenter, but it's a general introduction of the workshop (incl. description of workshop goal) with maybe a short overview of the area (maybe showing a few results from landmark studies)
3. During the interactive part a couple of statements or questions are presented and per statement/question a discussion is started. This could go like this: moderator asks for attendants that agree to put hands in the air and a bit later the same for those that disagree; moderator summaries in terms of a guessed percentage that agrees; after which he points first at 2 or 3 people that agreed (allowing them to give arguments for this); than he does the same with 2-3 people that disagreed (to jump from one person to another the moderator can always use the trick question 'And how do they do this (do they think about it) in (fill in land)?' or 'That sounds very much like an scientist argument, is there a practioneer that would like to react?'; and than the moderator ends the discussion about the first statement by summarizing again but now what the average arguments pro and contra were).
4. The moderators have to accept that they are mainly there to moderate the session; main goal is to make others talk (and listen!); the attendants have to accept (give warning at beginning of workshop!) that they should be short and direct when talking using up as little time as possible and still making their point (this also goes for those amongst us that are normally used to do all the talking ;). Everybody (also those really new in the field) have right to equal talking time!
5. Moderators are selected first and for all based on their moderation qualities (can you listen? can you make people talk that normally are to shy? can you summarize overall opinions?) and just partly on their scientific knowledge; the introductory presenter of course can be a hot shot (m/f) in terms of science and mega amount of publications, but esp. the moderators of the interactive part need first and for all to have the right people skills.
6. Preferably the groups are not too big (around 15-25 in 1 workshop is ideal is my experience); just to make sure the interaction will really get going...

Let me know what you think. Best regards,

Atze Boerstra