Abstracts: General Comments

General comments on the various abstracts are set out below, for reference and consideration.

Key Consideration

It is important to bear in mind that the papers are to be presented alongside the 12è Biennale Européenne des Villes et des Urbanistes which focuses on “Cities and Olympic and Paralympic Games, Feedback and Future”. Whilst the brief for the Young Planners Workshop is more general, there is a need for them to focus as much as possible on specific Olympic Games or other Mega-Events.

In each instance the emphasis of each paper should be firmly upon what can be learned from them. As such, in order for the papers to be most effective, the weight of each document and the group presentations should fall on the critical analysis and 'lessons learnt'. Whilst background context and methodologies are important, they should not receive any more attention than is necessary for them to be understood. This is not currently reflected in structures of any of the abstracts.

The outcome from this Workshop will be, as in previous years, for which examples are available online, a publication. The fact that each paper will be published should also therefore be considered from the outset. This needs to be reflected in the structure of the Papers.

For these reasons it has been decided that each Paper should adopt the same structure.

Standard Report Structure

There are several elements common to each paper, around which each paper should be structured. These are:

(1) **Introduction**: This would be a short, single paragraph, setting out the paper and its conclusions. Specific mention should be made of the research methodology employed at this point. The working hypotheses should also be made clear.

(2) **Context**: This would set out the background to the event. It would make clear the historical perspective, challenges and opportunities.

(3) **Event Description**: This would summarise the event itself, setting out the key characteristics (duration, funding and objectives).
(4) **Analysis:** This would be the largest element of the paper. It would explore the legacy of the event, its successes and failures, against the objectives set out in the previous section. These should have regard to the short, medium and long-term impacts. In situations such as with London 2012, where a relatively limited time has elapsed since the event, the longer-term could be speculated or forecast. Particular regard should be had to “the capability of the local actors and managers of securing the optimum impact through focussed and careful alignment of the event and its amenities with the long-term development requirements of the city”.

Within the chapter relating to analysis there should be clear sub-headings. These should relate to the key themes of the workshop. The purpose is to ensure that clear comparisons can be made between the respective papers. The following sub-headings should be used:

4.1 Urbanity  
4.2 Social Cohesion  
4.3 Values, Identity & Image  
4.4 Environmental Awareness  
4.5 Economic Competitiveness

(5) **Conclusions:** This should be a relatively short summary of the “lessons learnt”, with a view that these could be “transferable” in that they could be used to inform other events in the same country or elsewhere.

**Report Format & Weight**

There is merit in reiterating the formal requirements for all papers. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font Size</th>
<th>Arial 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Spacing</td>
<td>Multiple 1.15u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Length</td>
<td>12 Pages plus images, tables, and maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footnotes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>Harvard Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images/Tables</td>
<td>As many as appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structure should include numbered paragraphs. This should adopt the following style:

- Chapters: 1. Introduction. 2.-3.-4.-... 5.-Conclusions.
- Chapter Sub-Headings: 1.- 1.1.- 1.2.- ... 2.- 2.1.- 2.2.-... etc

Remember – Please write in plain, simple language, with very clear conclusions.

In terms of report length, there is scope to accommodate approximately 6,000 words of text across 12 pages without wide spacing, images, tables and references. It is assumed, therefore, that each paper will be broadly 3,500 words in total (7 written pages).
In considering the weight that should be given to each element of the document it is envisaged that the text would be split as follows*:

1. Introduction: 250 Words.
3. Event Description: 500 Words.
5. Conclusions: 500 Words.

*This split assumes a document of some 3,500 words. In longer documents, with more words, it is expected that the additional content is within the Analysis section as opposed to elsewhere.

Abstracts: General Comments

General thoughts on the abstracts presented and discussed thus far are, in no particular order, that:

- They should all be reorganised for the presentation and paper as above.

- Some are more academic than others – All papers must broadly align with each other in striking a balance between being robustly referenced but also clear and easy to understand. In this sense, the Serbian and London (UCL) proposals could adopt a slightly less “academic” tone.

- Some are more general than others – Whilst not a problem they need to be clear in terms of exactly what the papers refer to. They must be made as specific as possible.

- Some have abstracts which are shorter than others – The consideration of world exposition in Flanders is one example and that referring to an “Olympic Torch” is another. It remains to be seen how these will develop. More information needed please!

- Some papers take multiple examples – this somewhat relates to those which appear more general. Specific examples should be used. In the event that multiple cities and events are given consideration it becomes more difficult to achieve a depth of analysis. In these instances, therefore, the examples discussed should be limited to three per paper.