K. VICTOR HENCKEL
VON DONNERSMARCK

THE MARKET FOR MODEL
UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCES
IN GEOGRAPHICAL EUROPE

MARKET RESEARCH
The Author

K. Victor Henckel von Donnersmarck has been active in the youth education sector since 2001. He is a founding member and President of the Milan International Model United Nations (MILMUN) Association and has contributed to multiple other MUNs across Europe. He has acquired professional experience as a consultant with the United Nations on environmental issues, with a Swiss Foundation providing consulting and knowledge management services to international peacebuilding actors and in various other sectors. Since 2009 he has been a Guest Lecturer at the Bocconi CLAPI Master degree.

He is both a German and Swedish citizen and graduated with a Bachelor in Intl. Economics and Management from Università Bocconi, and a Master of Public Management from SDA Bocconi in Milan, Italy.

Europa Bottom-Up

The series Europa Bottom-Up is part of the European Projects of the Maecenata Foundation. It is edited by the Maecenata Institute and publishes working papers about European civil society that are within the field of activity of the Maecenata Foundation.

All issues are available for free download at: www.ebu.maecenata.eu

Imprint

„Europa-Bottom-Up‘ Berlin, Munich: Maecenata Foundation 2013

Published by

MAECENATA INSTITUTE at Humboldt-University Berlin,
Wilhelmstr. 67, 10117 Berlin, Germany
Phone: +49-30-28 38 79 09,
Fax: +49-30-28 38 79 10,
E-Mail: mi@maecenata.eu
Website: www.maecenata.eu

ISSN (Web) 2197-6821
URN:urn:nbn:de:0243-102013ebu057

Editorial supervision by Christian Schreier

All rights reserved.
Copyright by Creative Commons 3.0 Germany Licence.
The text represents only the opinion of the author.

Disclaimer: Despite careful control the publisher accepts no liability for any content and external links. The authors are solely responsible for the content of linked pages as well as for textual copyright issues.
EUROPA BOTTOM-UP
Nr. 5/2013

ARBEITSPAPIERE ZUR EUROPÄISCHEN ZIVILGESELLSCHAFT
EUROPEAN CIVIL SOCIETY WORKING PAPERS

K. VICTOR HENCKEL VON DONNERSMARCK

THE MARKET FOR MODEL UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCES
IN GEOGRAPHICAL EUROPE

Market Research
Executive Summary

A Model United Nations is an academic simulation of the United Nations Organization, where the mainly student-level participants assume the role of a diplomat and represent a country other than their own nationality. The aim of this alternative education approach is to allow participants to familiarize themselves with the UN system, investigate possible solutions to global issues and to research about another country’s culture, economy and political positions.

This market research aims at establishing baseline data through a quantitative analysis of the organizations managing this type of educational conferences in geographical Europe and to estimate its trends, areas of possible improvements and growth potential. After preliminary research to identify target organizations based on secondary data, two online questionnaires were prepared to collect primary data that target the conferences and their staff independently.

The organizations were contacted via email and data collection took place from the 16th September until the 3rd November 2009. The return rate for the questionnaires was high, with 41% of the identified organizations providing at least one staff response and 35% supplying details about their conference.

The estimates based on the returned data suggest a sizeable market worth more than 2 million Euros each year with over 20,000 annual participants in geographical Europe, including Cyprus and Turkey. The number of involved organizers has been stable at approximately 680 people over the studied time period (2008-2009).
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1. Introduction

The author first encountered the concept of “Model United Nations” (MUN) in high school, where it was offered as an extracurricular class. At university, the author contributed to establishing the first MUN in Milan, Italy, and was able to apply many of the theoretical management concepts of his studies. With growing interest from supporting institutions, the need for reliable data for comparisons with similar events grew. Although the author witnessed a strong growth of this type of events all around the World and especially Europe, no such information could be attained.

This market research thus aims at establishing baseline data through a quantitative analysis of this small educational segment of the non-profit sector in Europe and to estimate its trends, areas of possible improvements and growth potential.

1.1. What is a Model UN?

A Model United Nations is an academic simulation of the United Nations Organization, where the mainly student-level participants assume the role of a diplomat and represent a country other than their own nationality. The aim of this alternative education approach is to allow participants to familiarize themselves with the UN system, investigate possible solutions to global issues and to research about another country’s culture, economy and political positions.

Started by the Harvard University in 1927 as a simulation of the “League of Nations”, the practice was continued in 1953 after the creation of the UN. Since then, the number of similar events has spread around the globe and today amounts to “several hundred Model UN conferences” a year with “an estimated one million” participants.

Over the years, the scope of some of these simulations has been extended to include other international organizations, such as the European Union (EU), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Often the choice to include another organization is based on the geographic location of the event. Thus we can find several Model

---

2 Global MUN Website, <http://www.un.int/wcm/content/site/gmun/pid/8508> (last accessed 25.11.09)
EUs in its member countries, while a Model ASEAN is more common in the Asian area.

Apart from the academic simulation, the conferences usually feature several social events in the evenings with the aim of offering participants further opportunities to get to know each other. The unique ability to further intercultural understanding, friendship and international integration among the global youth is one of the biggest strengths of this type of event.

2. Methodology

2.1. Target

The primary targets of this market research are all organizations and their staff members in geographical Europe (including Cyprus and Turkey), which organize at least one Model United Nations conference per year. While secondary data will be used to identify the target organizations, primary data will be collected via questionnaires sent to these organizations and their staff.

2.2. Scope

In order to focus on a manageable area for the research, only those MUN organizations active in geographical Europe are considered (see fully coloured countries in Figure 1). A regional segmentation was adopted using the “Standard Country and Area Codes Classifications (M49)” by the United Nations Statistical Division into Eastern Europe (EEU), Northern Europe (NEU), Southern Europe (SEU), Western Europe (WEU) and Western Asia (WAS). The selected area includes a total of 38 countries, of which 11 can be found in SEU, 10 in NEU and EEU each, 7 in WEU and 2 in WAS (Cyprus and Turkey).

---

3 UN Statistics Division, <http://millenniumindicators.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49.htm> (last accessed 25.11.09)
A further segmentation was used regarding the European Union status of the countries in which the MUN organizations are active in order to enable a detailed comparison within (see Figure 2).

The following categories were chosen:

- **EU27**: The latest entries to the European Union: Bulgaria and Romania
- **EU25**: The countries of the 2004 enlargement: Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia
- **EU15**: The EU countries that joined until 1995: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Italy, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom
- **EUCA**: The EU candidate countries as of November 2009: Croatia, Turkey and Macedonia (the former Yugoslav Republic of)
- **NOEU**: The other European countries that are not part of or candidate countries to the EU
The map below illustrates the chosen segments:

![Map of Europe with different segments colored]

**Figure 2: Segmentation according to EU status**

### 2.3. Preliminary research

Since there is no official directory or listing of the organizations who manage simulations of the UN in Europe, several sources were used to acquire a basic list of MUN organizations. These include the “Model UN Database”\(^4\), maintained by the “Global Model UN” (GMUN), the conference calendar of the “UN Association of the USA” (UNA-USA)\(^5\), and the use of Internet search engines, such as Google.

The GMUN database comes closest to a full listing of the MUN organizations worldwide. It is the first MUN that has been organized by the United Nations Organization itself and was first held in August 2009. In order to identify

---

\(^4\) GMUN Model UN database, <http://www.un.int/wcm/content/site/gmun/pid/8799> (last accessed 30.09.09)

\(^5\) UNAUSA conference calendar, <http://www.unausa.org/muncalendar> (last accessed 30.09.09)
participants around the world, they conducted a research in 2008 and 2009 with the aim of listing all known MUN organizations. The UNA-USA calendar, on the other hand, allows for MUN organizations to add their conference to its database, which can then be searched according to several search parameters (e.g. country, size, age level etc.).

Thus, in order to establish a baseline list of organizations to contact for the subsequent data collection through questionnaires, the existing list of the GMUN database entries including all conferences in the target geographic area was copied. Each entry was then validated through the existence of a working website and reference to recent activity, such as website entries and/or a recent or upcoming conference or other event. Furthermore, a search was conducted on the UNA-USA calendar as well as Google to identify missing conferences.

The MUN organizations entries were then amended with the following data: Type, Focus, Region, EU, Name, Acronym, Web-Link, Email(s), City, Country, and Country ISO. If attainable, the founding year, the latest conference and/or activity, and academic level was recorded as well. A short description of the data categories can be found below:

- **Type**: The main focus of the organization
- **Selected**: Indicates if the organization has been contacted and for what purpose
- **Region**: The regional location of the organization (see Figure 1)
- **EU**: The location country according to its EU status (see Figure 2)
- **Name**: The full, official name of the organizations
- **Acronym**: The acronym used by the organization
- **Link**: The current link to the web presence of the organization
- **Email**: One or more emails of the organization and/or its team
- **City**: The name of the city in which the organizations is located
- **Country**: The country in which the organization is located
- **Country ISO**: The ISO name of the country in which the organization is located

A total of 81 MUN organizations were ultimately selected for participation in the market research. A complete list can be found in Annex 1 on page 48.

---

2.4. Questionnaire design

Since the objective of this research is to collect both information about the organizers and the organizations’ conferences it was decided to prepare two separate ones, which target each specifically. This helped to reduce their length and thus the time necessary to fill them out, which should have a positive effect on the overall return rate.

Several drafts of the questionnaires were prepared and tested by friends of the author. The testers included both people with and without knowledge of the MUN conferences as to ensure the clarity of the questions asked. Finally, they were subject to a check by the supervising staff of the SDA Bocconi University. Both questionnaires are discussed in further detail below.

2.5. Questionnaire A: Organizers

The first questionnaire is directed at the individuals contributing to the organization of the MUN conferences.

The first goal is to create a profile of the standard MUN contributor, with the averages of age, gender and experience with the organization and participation in this type of conference. Second, the research aims at identifying the areas of the organization that are perceived as most and least time consuming as well as those considered most and least challenging. Furthermore, the extend to which external advice has been used, its perceived usefulness and in which areas support is desired will be asked.

In order to ensure a common understanding of the different areas of responsibility, eight of the most important ones were defined at the beginning of the questionnaire:

2. Finances: Budget, accounting, reimbursements, etc.
3. Fundraising: Sponsor relations, grants & other external sources of revenues
4. IT (Information Techn.): Website and other information technology used
5. Logistics: Conference venue, Catering, Accommodation etc.
6. Participant Management: Registration, Selection, Participant relations etc.
7. Promotion/Marketing: Advertising & promotion of the event with selected target groups
8. Team/Project Management: Coordination & guidance of the people organizing the conference

The questionnaire for organizers as visible to participants can be found in (p.50).
2.6. Questionnaire B: Conferences

The second questionnaire is focused on obtaining basic data, such as price, size, length and staff requirements, about the conferences over the past two years. With sufficient data it should be possible to estimate market averages for these categories as well as identify trends.

Furthermore, an effort will be made to estimate the overall market size by recording the conference’s budgets, the amount of in-kind contributions received, number of sponsors and their percentage share in the budget of the conferences. Finally, by obtaining data about the founding year of the organizations, their legal status and, if different from the founding year, the year of legal incorporation, it should be possible to estimate the growth of the sector for the first time and provide a basis for further research.

The questionnaire for conference details as presented to participating organizations can be found in Annex 3.

2.7. Questionnaire distribution

The links to the online questionnaires were sent to the previous identified email addresses of the target organizations (see 2.3), accompanied by a short description of the research’s purpose and the author’s contact details for questions. A log was created to keep track of when and to which email addresses were contacted. Regular reminders were sent to those organizations and their staff that did not respond or participate while a confirmation of successful participation was sent to those who did. The original deadline was extended once from the 10th October 2009 to the 30th October 2009 upon the request of several organizations.

The target return rate for the questionnaires was set at 10% or more.

3. Questionnaire results

The following questionnaire results were recorded from the 16th September until the 3rd November 2009. A comprehensive summary of the data can be found in the Annex 4 for questionnaire A (organizers) and in Annex 5 for questionnaire B (conference details).
3.1. Results A: Organizers

A total of 87 valid questionnaires by organizers were received by the deadline on the 3rd November 2009. Together, they represent 33 different MUN organizations from 18 countries, which amounts to a high 41% return rate of those contacted (see Annex 1).

Table 1 below lists all represented MUNs and the number of the respective participating organizers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BALMUN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>InnMUN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MUNUSAL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERMUN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IYLC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>OLMUN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIMUN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LahnMUN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PIMUN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIMUN/SINUB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MediolaMUN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POLMUN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISMUN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MILMUN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RIMUN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DanMUN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MIMUN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOFIMUN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINMUN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MUN-SH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TEIMUN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GeMUN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MUNA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UMUN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIMUN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MUNOL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNISCA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HamMUN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MunoM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VIMUN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTOMUN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MUNTR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ZAGIMUN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: MUNs (total 33) represented by number (#) of organizers (total 87)

With 35.6% (31) of the participants the majority of organizers contribute to MUN organizations in Germany, followed by 9.2% (8) in the Netherlands and 6.9% (6) in Italy, as shown in Figure 3. The other countries include Austria, Croatia, Finland, and Spain with 4.6% (4) each, Denmark, Romania, the Russian Federation, Sweden and Switzerland with 3.5% (3) each, the Czech Republic, Poland and Turkey with 2.3% (2) each, and France and Serbia with 1.2% (1) contributors each.
Figure 3: Countries where organizers contribute to an MUN

Figure 4: Organizer's country of contribution in Europe

With 85.1% (74) of the organizers active in the European Union (EU27), only 6.9% (6) are active in EU candidate countries (EUCA) and 8.1% (7) in non-EU countries (NOEU). A vast majority of the observed MUN activity thus takes place within the enlarged European Union (see Figure 4).

When looking at the EU itself, one can see that 73.6% (64) of the organizers work in the EU15 countries, compared to only 4.6% (4) in the enlarged EU25 and 6.9% (6) in the new EU27 member countries.

The gender distribution was almost perfect, with 51.7% (45) females and 48.3% (42) males (see Figure 5). The average age was 25.8 years, which was influenced
by several outliers with a maximum of 62 years and minimum of 17 years. The median age observed was 24 years, the 1\textsuperscript{st} quartile 21, the 3\textsuperscript{rd} quartile 27 and the most observed age was 22 years (see Figure 6).

The participant pool consists of 24 different nationalities, of which 77.0\% are from EU member countries. The number of Germans participating was exceptionally high with 32.2\% (28), followed by Dutch organizers with 9.2\% (8). Figure 7 below shows the entire participant pool.

Figure 5: Gender distribution of organizers / Figure 6: Distribution of organizers’ age

Figure 7: Primary nationalities of organizers
With 77.0% (67), most of the organizers have EU nationalities, while 16.1% (14) belong to non-EU countries and only 6.9% (6) come from EU candidate countries (see Figure 9). The distribution of nationalities within the EU is strongly concentrated on EU15 countries with 70.1% (61), compared to 4.6% (4) from EU27 and 2.3% (2) from EU25 countries.

Figure 8: Graphical distribution of primary nationalities in Europe and Turkey

Figure 9: Distribution of organizers’ primary nationalities in Europe
The average number of MUNs that the participants had organized was 3.61 and the distribution is strongly left skewed with some outliers who have experience with organizing 10 or more conferences (11.49%; 10). This is mostly likely due to a more professional involvement with MUNs, for example as part of academic staff of high schools charged with this task. Together with the average age, the observations suggest that most organizers are students who contribute to MUNs during their time as students.

Figure 10: Number of MUNs organized per questionnaire participant

The organizers’ experience with participating in MUN conferences themselves is more evenly distributed. While the average of attended MUNs is 4.7, the observed mode is 10 or more conferences. Although 13.79% (12) stated to have
no MUN experience as delegates, chairs or journalists at all, 86.21% (75) had at least one. This data suggests that most of the organizers have been inspired to contribute to the organization of MUNs by participating in one.

Figure 12: Organizer’s MUN experience

The year of most recent involvement with the organization of a MUN was 2009 for 80.5% (70), 2008 for 16.1%, and 2007 for 2.3% (2) of the questionnaire participants. The high number of organizers who have either had recent involvement or is currently active can be considered positive, since their knowledge about their activities should still be fresh and increase the relevance of the data provided.

The main responsibilities of the organizer’s were quite evenly distributed, with a high outliner of 67.8% (59) for “Team/Project management” and a low one of 18.4% (16) for “IT (website etc)” (see Figure 15). A total of 265 recorded responsibilities yield an average of 3.05 per participant, slightly more than the
requested 3 maximum. This high number shows that most of the organizers take on several tasks, suggesting a generally low degree of formal separation of work tasks and/or a poor definition and clarification of the responsibilities of each staff member. Although this might be practical in a small and amicable organization team, it might pose problems when responsibilities are handed over to new staff members and/or when conflicts of interest arise within the team.

Figure 14: Year of most recent involvement with the organization of a MUN

The high amount of questionnaire participants who claim to be at least partially responsible for team management can probably be explained as follows. First, it is likely that senior and/or members of the organizations with a higher level of responsibility felt more inclined to participate in the questionnaires as part of their perceived duty to make the work of the organization known. Furthermore, since most of the organizers contribute to a MUN conference on a voluntary basis (see next paragraph), organizational structures are likely to be more flexible and flat, requiring a certain amount of team and overall project management from all members.

Figure 15: Main responsibilities by organizers (max 3 each)
According to the data provided, it is very uncommon to receive monetary compensation for the work with a MUN organization. Only 6.9% (6) claimed to receive such compensation, compared to 93.1% (81) who work for free. This observation is probably due to the fact that most organizers are students who volunteer for the work, compared to some who are charged with this task by a larger institution, such as a High School or local authorities.

![Figure 16: Organizers receiving monetary reward](image)

The most commonly used team language is English, which 69.0% (60) of the organizers are using, compared to 21.8% (19) who use German and 9.2% (8) who use other languages. The likely explanation for the high use of English is the high number of different nationalities, as observed above, who are able to communicate most effectively in this “lingua franca”. This is further strengthened by the fact that many universities nowadays offer classes or even entire degree courses in English.

![Figure 17: Team language used by organizers](image)

The average time invested by each organizer was 7.86 hours per week, while 48.3% (42) claimed to have put 10 or more hours per week into the MUN organization. The most observed number for this data was also 10 or more hours per week while the median equalled 8 hours per week. This highly left skewed data shows a very strong time commitment by the organizers. It also suggests that many of the necessary tasks are very time intensive and hard to standardize and/or automate in order to increase efficiency.
The questionnaire defined “high time intensive areas” as “areas [that] generally take MUCH time when organizing your conference” and the participants selected a total of 260 areas for this question, equal to an average of 2.99 selections each.

The area that was identified by organizers to generally take most time to complete is that of “Academic preparation” with 19.2% (50), closely followed by “Participant management” with 18.1% (47), “Project/Team management” with 16.5% (43) and “Fundraising” with 15.8% (41). Roughly in the middle of the answers’ spread we can find “Logistics” with 13.5% (35). Rather few of the organizers think that “Promotion/Marketing” is time intensive, with only 6.5% (17), which is similar to “IT (website etc)” with 6.2% (16). With only 4.2% (11) choices, least of the surveyed consider managing the “Finances” of their MUN very time consuming.
The questionnaire defined “low time intensive areas” as “areas [that] generally take LITTLE time when organizing your conference” and the participants selected a total of 158 areas for this question, equal to an average of 1.82 selections each.

The majority of organizers considered the area of “IT (website etc)” as an area that generally took little time to complete, with 31.0% (49). Second came the area of “Promotion/Marketing” with 17.7% (28), followed by “Finances” with 14.6% (23) and “Project/Team management” with 10.3% (16). An almost equal number deemed the areas of “Fundraising” with 8.2% (13), “Participant management” with 7.6% (12) and “Logistics” with 6.3% (10) as low time intensive. With only 4.4% (7), least organizers selected “Academic Preparation” as an area that generally takes little time to complete.

Figure 21: Low time intensive areas as identified by organizers

When we compare the “High” with the “Low” time intensive areas that the organizers selected, we can observe a pretty clear relation for the respective pairs (see Figure 22). The clearest agreement exists on the area of “Academic preparation”, with a difference of 75.4% (43) in favour if high. The second highest difference can be observed for “Participant management” with 59.3% (35) in favour of high, followed by “Logistics” with 55.6% (25), and “Fundraising” with 51.9% (28), all agreeing on high again. A quite high consent was recorded for the area of “IT (website etc)” as an easy one with a difference of 50.8% (33). Agreement on “Project/Team management” being a high time intensive area was less clear, with a 45.8% (27) gap, as well as with “Finances”, with a 35.3% (12) difference. Least consensus could be found for “Promotion/Marketing”, with only a 24.4% (11) difference considering the area low time consuming.
Noteworthy is the high amount of selections organizers did for high time intensive areas (260) compared to low time intensive ones (158). This means that the organizers consider 1.65 (165%) as many areas to take generally much time to organize than little, suggesting a high overall time requirement. This corresponds well with the recorded average hours per week contributed as can be seen in Figure 18 and / Figure 19 (p. 21).

Figure 22: Comparison of HIGH and LOW time intensive areas as identified by organizers

For the next two questions (challenging and easy areas), the questionnaire asked about the “challenges” the organizers faced when contributing to the MUN conferences. The definition of "challenge" was given as “anything, such as a demanding task, that calls for special effort or dedication”7.

The questionnaire asked organizers to identify “areas [that] are generally challenging to organize” and the participants selected a total of 233 areas for this question, equal to an average of 2.68 selections each.

The area most organizers deemed challenging is that of “Fundraising” with 25.3% (59) of all selections, followed by “Academic preparation” with 14.6% (34). The areas of “Finances” and “Promotion/Marketing” received an equal amount of 12.0% (28), while “Participant management” and “Project/Team management” were given 10.7% (25) of the choices each. A total of 9.9% (23) of

---

the organizers thought “Logistics” was challenging to deal with and only 4.7% (11) “IT (website etc)”. 

What is clear from this data is that Fundraising is seen as the single most challenging activity of a MUN organization. The fact that the MUN concept is still rather unknown among most students, universities and potential sponsors can help to explain this observation. Especially education institutions need to be convinced that a well run affiliated MUN can act as a formidable marketing tool, bringing dozens, if not hundreds, of proactive international students to its doorsteps. Combined with targeted advertisings it can help to markedly raise the international profile of the institution as well as recruit new students for its courses.

The low number of questionnaire participants who were responsible for IT might be an explanation for the low number of organizers who selected IT to be a challenging area (see Figure 15). Since much of the work required for IT tends to be “bulk” tasks, for example the set-up of a website, many team members might not be entirely clear about the challenge of that area. Furthermore, many MUN organizations might limit their investments into IT due to a lack of resources.

![Figure 23: Challenging areas as identified by organizers](image-url)
The questionnaire asked organizers to identify “areas [that] are generally NOT challenging to organize” and the participants selected a total of 168 areas for this question, equal to an average of 1.93 selections each.

As suggested by the observations in the previous question, most organizers consider “IT (website etc)” as generally not challenging to organize, with 25.6% (43), and least think that “Fundraising” is easy, with 1.8% (3) selections. The other areas are within a closer range, where “Promotion/Marketing” is deemed easy by 15.5% (26), “Academic preparation”, “Participant management” and “Project/Team management” by 11.9% (20) each, and “Finances” and “Logistics” by 10.7% (18) each.

![Figure 24: Easy areas as identified by organizers](image)

When we compare the “Challenging” with the “Easy” areas that the organizers identified, we can observe a general correspondence for the respective pairs (see Figure 25). Although the differences between the two are quite small in most areas, there is a very clear agreement on “Fundraising”, which 59 organizers considered to be a challenging area (compared to 3 easy; 56/90.3% difference), and “IT (website etc), which 43 organizers regarded as an easy area (compared to 11 challenging; 32/59.3% difference). A rather high consent was observed on the areas of “Academic preparation”, which 34 organizers deemed to be challenging (compared to 20 easy; 14/25.9% difference), and in “Finances”, which 28 thought was challenging (compared to 18 easy; 10/21.7% difference). Some agreement was surveyed within the areas of “Logistics”, which 23 organizers considered challenging (compared to 18 easy; 5/12.2% difference), “Participant management”, which 25 deemed challenging (compared to 20 easy; 5/11.1% difference), and “Project/Team management”, which 25 judged challenging (compared to 20 easy; 5/11.1% difference). Least consent was
observed for the area of “Promotion/Marketing”, which 28 organizers regarded as challenging (compared to 26 easy, 2/3.7% difference).

Again noteworthy is the high amount of selections organizers did for challenging areas (233) compared to easy ones (168). This means that the organizers consider 1.39 (139%) as many areas to be generally challenging to organize than easy, suggesting a high overall task complexity.

Figure 25: Challenging compared to easy areas as indentified by organizers

Asked if the work for the MUN conference had been a “Personal challenge” by requiring the organizers to develop new skills to master their area of responsibility, the average gave a mark of 3.66 in a scale from one to five. The most observed grade given was 4 with an equal median (4). The left skewed data suggests that most organizers considered their involvement with an MUN organization as a personal challenge and were able to develop new skills in the process.

Figure 26: Grades of personal challenge / Figure 27: Distribution of personal challenge ratings
Roughly two thirds (67%; 58) of the organizers asserted to have received some form of external advice when organizing the conference, which was defined as “contributions to the organizations of your conference not originating from the members of the core team originally charged with the organization of the conference” (see p.50).

Figure 28: Number of organizers who received external advice

The type of external advice received by most of the organizers was that of “Academic preparation” with 25.5% (37), followed by “Fundraising” with 13.8% (20) and “IT (website etc)” with 13.1% (19). External advice on “Finances” and “Promotion/Marketing” was given to 11.7% (17) organizers each. A total of 9.7% (14) organizers got advice in the area of “Logistics”, 8.3% (12) in “Project/Team management” and least in “Participant management” with only 6.2% (9).

Figure 29: Type of external advice received by organizers

As can be seen from Figure 30, the main source (50%) of external advice is that of former organization staff, of which 32% comes from locally available and 18% from not locally available organizers. The second biggest source is that of Academic Faculty (27%), followed by Business (12%) and Other sources (11%). These figures indicate a strong connection in most organizations to previous staff members, but which can also point to a difficulty of passing on institutional knowledge from one generation to the next.
The usefulness of the external advice received was rated fairly high with an average of 4.19 points out of 5 and a mode of 4. This suggests a high effectiveness of the support received and should encourage those organizers who have not taken advantage of external advice to consider it.

The responsibility area in which most organizers desired external advice is that of “Fundraising”, with 26.9% (60). Support in both “Finances” and “Promotion/Marketing” was sought after by 16.1% (36) each, closely followed by “Academic preparation” with 15.7% (35). In the field of “IT (website etc)” 7.6% (17) were looking for counsel, in “Project/Team management” 5.8% (13) and in “Logistics” 6.3% (14). Least organizers were interested in advice for “Participant management” with only 5.4% (12).
The average number of areas in which the organizers desired external advice is 2.56, while the most observed number is 2. The strongly right skewed data suggests that all questionnaire participants identified at least one area of responsibility where the organization they contribute to could benefit from external advice to improve operations.

The overall satisfaction with their experience contributing to an MUN was very high, with an average rating of 4.37 out of 5. Both the most observed grade and median observed was equal to 5 as can be seen in Figure 36.
The willingness of 64.4% (56) of the organizers to be available for a subsequent interview, if requested, shows a high commitment and motivation to contribute to this type of study. A fact that can be considered encouraging for anyone who is interested in pursuing further research in this field.

Some 13 organizers (14.9%) left comments in the designated area at the end of the questionnaire. They were all of a positive and supporting tone and expressed a general feeling that this market research was welcomed in order to increase the awareness of the organization’s activities and to consequently strengthen their clout when dealing with existing and new partners, especially potential sponsors.
3.2. Results B: Conferences
Conference details were received from a total of 28 MUN organizations (see Table 2) out of 81 contacted, which amounts to a 35% return rate for questionnaire B. Together, they represent 44.7% (17) of the countries in the selected area, namely geographical Europe and Turkey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BALMUN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>InnMUN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>MUNUSAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BIMUN</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>IYLC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>OLMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BIMUN/SINUB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>LahmMUN</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>POLMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BISMUN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>MediolaMUN</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>SOFIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DanMUN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>MILMUN</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>TEIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FINMUN</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>MIMUN</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>UMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GeMUN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>MUN-SH</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>UNISCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>GIMUN</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>MUNOL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>VIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>HamMUN</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>MUNTR</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>ZAGIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HISTOMUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: List of MUN organizations that provided conference details

Figure 39: Graphical distribution of conference locations in Europe and Turkey
With 28.6% (8) of the participating organisations, most are active in Germany, followed by 20.7% (3) in Italy, and 7.1% (2) in Austria and the Netherlands each. The remaining 12 organizations are from one country each as can be seen in Figure 40 below.

Figure 40: Countries of participating MUN organizations

When looking at the country locations according to their EU status, we can see that a majority of 82.1% (23) are located in the enlarged EU, compared to only 7.1% (2) in EU candidate countries and 10.7% (3) in non-EU countries. Within the EU, we find 67.9% (19) of the organizations in the EU15 countries and 7.1% (2) in the EU25 and EU27 each. The sample that provided details about their conferences thus represents the identified organizations in Europe well (see Annex 1, p.48).

Figure 41: Conference distribution according to EU status
The average founding year of the participating 28 MUN organizations was 2002 compared to the most observed year of 2007. As Figure 44 shows, is the median year 2004.5, the 1st quartile 1998.75 and the 3rd one 2007.

Figure 42: Founding years of participating MUNs

As can be seen from the right skewed data in Figure 43, a clear majority of 67.9% (19) of the organizations were founded in or after 2000 compared to 32.1% (9) before 2000. This shows a clear increase in the number of MUN organizations in the past years, a trend that is likely to continue as the concept spreads and enough support and participants can be attracted to sustain the growth.

Figure 43: Foundations of MUN organizations in or after 2000

The most common type of incorporation is that as a non-profit organization, which 18 of the organizations chose. A further 10 are registered with a university
(e.g. as student group) and four decided to incorporate as a foundation. Two organizations are not registered or incorporated in any way and only one works as a for-profit organization.

All of the 6 (21.43%) organizations, which indicated two simultaneous types of legal status, were both registered with a university and incorporated as a non-profit organization.

Figure 45: Type of incorporation of participating MUNs

The average year of incorporation is 2003 and thus one year higher/later then that of the average founding (2002). As illustrated by Figure 47, the most observed year of incorporation is 2007, the earliest incorporation took place in 1990, the most recent in 2009, the median year is 2004, the 1st quartile is 2000 and the 3rd one 2007.

Figure 46: Year of incorporation by participating MUNs
With 28 (82.8%) of the conferences, the vast majority of the surveyed MUNs use English as their only official language while one MUN (3.4%) uses only German (see Figure 49). Four (13.8%) are bilingual, with two (6.9%) being English-French, one (3.4%) English/Russian, and one (3.4%) English/Italian. This shows that English is not only the main language used by the teams organizing the conferences (see Figure 17, p.20), but generally dominates this type of event within Europe.

All participating MUN organizations manage only one conference per year, except for one with two. The data is thus highly concentrated and right skewed as can be seen in Figure 50, with an average frequency of 1.04, a maximum of 2
and with the minimum, mode, median, 1st and 3rd quartile all equal to 1. The rule of thumb is therefore one event per organization per year, suggesting that their organizational capacity is limited and/or local conditions do not permit a higher frequency.

![Graph showing distribution of conference frequency]

Figure 50: Distribution of conference frequency / Figure 51: Frequency of conferences organized by participating MUN organizations

### 3.3. Conference details 2008 – 2009

The following conference details have been based only on those 16 MUN organizations that were able to provide data for two consecutive events in 2008 and 2009. The sample thus represents 57.14% of the total participating organizations (28) and 19.75% of all identified for this market research in Europe and Turkey (81). For a more complete summary of all submitted conference details from 2007 to 2009 please see the Annex 5 from point 8 onwards. Table 3 below lists all MUN organizations and their home country within the sample and Figure 52 gives a graphical representation of their respective locations.

![Map showing location of sample MUN organizations]

Figure 52: Location of the sample MUN organizations 2008 – 2009
Table 3: List of sample MUN organizations 2008 - 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIMUN</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DanMUN</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FINMUN</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GeMUN</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GIMUN</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>InnMUN</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LahnMUN</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MILMUN</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MIMUN</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MUN-SH</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MUNOL</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MUNUSAL</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>OLMUN</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SOFIMUN</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>UNISCA</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>VIMUN</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average conference size of the sample organizations fell by 3.48% (-9.13) from 262.38 in 2008 to 253.25 in 2009, in contrast to the median, which rose by 7.14% (15) from 210 to 225 in the same period. The maximum increased as well, from 600 (2008) to 650 (2009), while the 3rd quartile decreased from 462.5 (2008) to 450 (2009) and the 1st quartile from 91 (2008) to 90 (2009). The only variable that remained unchanged was the minimum (50).

The total participants for the sample organizations sum up to 4198 in 2008 and 4052 in 2009, which represents a small drop of 3.48% (-146) over that period.

The average duration of a conference in 2008 was 5.19 days, which rose to 5.44 days in 2009. While the median and mode remained both unchanged at 5 days, the maximum and 3rd quartile both rose from 7 (2008) to 9 (2009) days for the former and from 6 (2008) to 6.25 (2009) days for the latter. The minimum and 1st quartile stayed the same with 4.75 days and 3 days respectively.
When looking at Figure 55: Sample conferences' durations in 2008 compared to 2009 / Figure 56, it becomes obvious that the increase of two conferences by 2 days each is responsible for the above-described changes in the data. Generally, the duration of a MUN conference has remained stable since last year.
The set-up of the organizations’ core teams remained pretty stable with the same average of 8.38 staff members for both 2008 and 2009. Also the mode, maximum and 3rd quartile stayed the same (10) for both years. The median, on the other hand, rose slightly from 9.50 (2008) to 10 (2009) as well as the minimum from 4 (2008) to 5 (2009), while the 1st quartile fell from 6.75 (2008) to 6 (2009).

The number of core organizers has thus only changed marginally. Consequently, MUNs rely on a rather large supply of dedicated volunteers to manage a conference every year, which puts pressure on the ability to pass on to a next generation and secure continuity.

While the average participation fee increased somewhat from 77.56 € in 2008 to 78 € in 2009, the median fell from 70 € to 65 € in the same period. Both the maximum and minimum stayed the same with 180 € and 20 € respectively. The 1st and 3rd quartile increased their difference by a small amount, falling from 39.50 € (2008) to 38.75 € (2009) for the former and rising from 98.50 € (2008) to 100 € (2009) for the latter.

These minimal movements in the participation fee structure of the sample MUN organizations show a stable price configuration and suggest a widespread consent about the value of each offered conference.
Figure 59: Sample conferences' standard participation fee in 2008 compared to 2009 / Figure 60: Distribution of standard participation fees

The average budget of the sample organizations was calculated using the midpoints of the available ranges and equals 27.031 € in 2008 and 25.938 in 2009, a 4.05% (-1.094 €) drop over that period. The estimated total budget of the sample is 432.500 € in 2008 and 415.000 € in 2009, which represents a decrease of 17.500 € (-4.05%). Figure 61 shows the recorded budget ranges where a move towards the 2nd and 3rd range from the lower and upper ranges can be observed.

Figure 61: Budget ranges of sample organizations
The total number of in-kind contributions that the sample organizations received fell from 35 in 2008 to 32 in 2009, equal to a drop in the average from 2.19 (2008) to 2.00 (2009) or -8.57%. Although they were able to receive the same support for the “Conference venue” (11/11), “Catering” (3/3), “Accommodation” (4/4) and “IT support” (3/3), in-kind contributions in the form of “Office supplies” (7/5; -28.57%) and “Technical equipment” (6/4; -33.33%) fell. The only increase was recorded for “Merchandise” (1/2; +100%).

Figure 62: In-kind contributions received by sample organizations

The average number of cash sponsors per sample organization decreased from 4 in 2008 to 3.67 in 2009 (-8.33%), while the median dropped by 8.33% from 2.50 (2008) to 2.00 (2009). As can be seen from Figure 63, the data has been concentrated and is more right skewed since the last year. The 3rd quartile fell from 6.5 (2008) to 5 (2009) and the minimum from 1 (2008) to 0 (2009).

Figure 63: Number of sample organizations’ cash sponsors / Figure 64: Distribution of sample organizations’ cash sponsors
The average sponsor contribution dropped slightly in line with the other observations from 45.6% in 2008 to 45.0% in 2009 (see Figure 65: Sponsor contributions to the budget of sample MUN organizations in % / Figure 66). Despite this drop, the participating MUN organizations are thus still largely dependent on the contributions of external sponsors to realize their conferences. Figure 65 shows the percentage contribution by sponsors to the overall budget as recorded in the questionnaire.

4. Market estimates

In order to attempt some estimates about the researched market, the following part will use the data described in the subsection of part 3 “Conference details 2008-2009” and available in detail in Annex 5.

4.1. Participants

Using the above-recorded data for the average conference size in the sample of MUN organizations (see p.38), we can make an estimation of the total number of MUN participants in the research area using the following formula:

Average conference size * identified organizations

Since the average frequency of conferences per year is almost equal to one, it can be omitted from the equation. The results are then the following:
262.38 * 81 = 21,252 participants in Europe in 2008
253.25 * 81 = 20,513 participants in Europe in 2009

These numbers suggest that the number of participants dropped slightly by -3.84% (-739) since last year. Reasons for this could well include the general economic decline in Europe in the same time. Potential participants might be unable to finance the participation fee and the usually considerably higher accompanying costs, such as transport, food and accommodation.

Figure 67: Estimated total MUN participants in 2008 - 2009

4.2. Core organizers

As illustrated by Figure 57: Sample conferences’ core organization team sizes in 2008 compared to 2009 / Figure 58 (p.39), has the average size of the core organizers of the sample MUN organizations remained stable at 8.38. Thus, we can use the following simple formula to estimate the total amount of organizers in the research area:

Average core team size * identified organizations

Adding the relevant data gives us the following result:

8.38 * 81 = 678 total core organizers in Europe in 2008 and 2009

This suggests that about 680 people are directly involved with the organization of a MUN conference in Europe each year. The fact that this number has stayed the same over the two years period indicate that enough people have been found to replace parting organizers.
4.3. Participation fees collected

Together with the average participation fee described above (see p. 40), we can use the estimated total MUN participants to approximate the total amount of fees collected by the identified MUN organizations. Since the first estimate includes all participants of the conference, i.e. also the non-paying ones such as chairs, support-staff, last-minute drop-outs and organizers themselves, we will deduct 20% of the number in our formula:

Average participation fee * total MUN participants (est.) * 0.8

Substituting the correct values we get:

77.56 € * 21,252 * 0.8 = 1,318,710 € in fees collected in 2008

87.00 € * 20,513 * 0.8 = 1,280,027 € in fees collected in 2009

These numbers imply that in both 2008 and 2009 more than 1 million Euros in participation fees were collected by the MUN organizations in Europe and Turkey. Since the vast majority of them do not pay any monetary compensation to their staff, most of it is likely to have been used to pay for the expenses of the conferences.
Two different estimates will be calculated in order to quantify the market size of the MUN organizations in Europe, using the data obtained from the above sample conference details for 2008 and 2009. This dual approach aims to enable a crosscheck of the results and this to increase the reliability of the estimates.

A) Average budget estimate

The first estimate uses the average budget calculated (see Figure 61) and multiplies it with the number of MUN organizations identified for the research (81 total). This rather crude formula allows us a first idea of the total market size in terms of organizations’ budget:

Average budget size $\times$ identified organizations

When we plug in the respective number we receive the following results:

27,031 € $\times$ 81 = 2,189,531 € total market size (budget) in Europe in 2008

25,938 € $\times$ 81 = 2,100,938 € total market size (budget) in Europe in 2009

These numbers suggest that the overall market size of the MUN conferences in Europe and Turkey is over 2 million Euros big and dropped by 4.05% (-88,594 €) in the period from 2008 to 2009.

B) Fees collected & sponsor contribution estimate

The second estimate uses the data available for average participation fees collected (see p.40) and the average sponsor contribution given to the MUN organizations (see p.43). When multiplied with the number of identified organizations, it should provide a good approximation of the overall budget in the research area. The formula is the following:
\[(\text{Avg. sponsor contrib.} \times \text{avg. budget}) + \text{avg. fees collected}] \times \text{identified organizations}\]

Adding the relevant data gives us the following result:

\[
[(45.63\% \times 27.031 \, \text{€}) + 16.280 \, \text{€}] \times 81 = 2.317.684 \, \text{€ total market size (budget) in 2008}
\]

\[
[(45.00\% \times 25.938 \, \text{€}) + 15.803 \, \text{€}] \times 81 = 2.225.449 \, \text{€ total market size (budget) in 2009}
\]

According to these calculations the overall budget is again in the area above 2 million Euros and suffered a similar drop from 2008 to 2009, in this case by 3.98% (-92.235 €).

The two budget estimates suggest that the overall market size of the MUN conferences in Europe is over 2 million Euros per year. When compared, we can see that their difference is never more than 6% of the respective totals and equal 128.152 € in 2008 and 124.511 € in 2009 (see / Figure 71). Although the market seems to have shrunken in 2009, the reduction is not very high and can be considered rather stable in the wake of the current financial turmoil and the effect it has on sponsors and participants individual budgets.

Figure 70: MUN market size estimates A & B / Figure 71: Absolute difference between MUN budget estimates A & B
5. Conclusion

The high number of replies to the questionnaires has allowed a detailed first analysis of this emerging non-profit segment. The estimates suggest a sizeable market worth more than 2 million Euros each year with over 20,000 annual participants in geographical Europe, including Cyprus and Turkey. The number of involved organizers has been stable at approximately 680 people over the past year, which points to a sustainable recruitment of staff by the organizations. The slight reductions in both the number of total participants as well as the drop in overall market size has to be seen in the context of the current economic crisis, which reached its peak in the middle of the researched time period. This has most certainly been a main reason for the reduction in the number of sponsors as well as the amount of cash and in-kind contributions received by the organizations.

Basically all analyzed organizations depend on volunteers, mostly students staying for a maximum of two years, to offer their service. Therefore, the ability of the organizations to pass from one generation of staff to the next is essential for the continuity of the conference. The establishment and consequent fostering of partnerships with local institutions, both education and government, can help by offering expertise and provide in-kind contributions, such as the conference venue. Furthermore, a clearer definition of tasks can help to reduce the time requirement for some of the work while enable to the staff to clarify areas of responsibilities and delegate work more efficiently. Finally, each organization should to be able to retain the knowledge that each generation of staff generated and aim to create institutional knowledge that can be easily passed on.

The increasing numbers of foundations and incorporations is a good sign that the sector is growing. On the other hand, this might not be sustainable as many founders who strive to spread the MUN concept are evidently idealistic and willing to put a lot of unpaid time into the organization. Basic demand and supply checks can help to avoid investing into a conference that does not have enough local support and demand to be successful. As the high number of organizers who consider fundraising both a high time intensive and challenging task tells the quest for the financial means is all too often a difficult one.

If this sector is able to grow organically by increasing the amount of people who are willing to pay for such an experience, while simultaneously convincing relevant external stakeholders, such as universities and corporations about its advantages, then there should be little in the way for a further spread of the MUN concept in Europe.
### 6. Appendix

**Annex 1: Full list of selected MUN organizations for the market research (81 total)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reg.</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Akronym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Baltic Model UN</td>
<td>BALMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>NOEU</td>
<td>Belgrade International Model UN</td>
<td>BIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>NOEU</td>
<td>Belorussian International Model UN</td>
<td>BELAMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Berlin Model UN</td>
<td>BERMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Bonn International Model UN</td>
<td>BIMUN/SINUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Bremen International Model UN</td>
<td>BRIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>EU27</td>
<td>Bucharest International Student Model UN</td>
<td>BISMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Cambridge University Model UN</td>
<td>CUIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Cardiff Model UN</td>
<td>MUNCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Catalonia Model United Nations</td>
<td>CMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>EU27</td>
<td>Cluj-Napoca Model UN</td>
<td>NapoMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Danish Model UN</td>
<td>DanMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Deutsche Schule Athen Model UN</td>
<td>DSAMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Duisburg - Essen Model UN</td>
<td>DuEMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>NOEU</td>
<td>Eurasia Model UN</td>
<td>EurasiaMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Finnish Model UN</td>
<td>FINMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Freie Universität Model UN</td>
<td>FU ModelUUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>NOEU</td>
<td>Geneva International MUN</td>
<td>GIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Genoa Model UN</td>
<td>GeMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Haarlem Model UN</td>
<td>HMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Hamburg Model UN</td>
<td>HamMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Iberian Model UN</td>
<td>IMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>NOEU</td>
<td>Iceland Model UN</td>
<td>IceMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Inn Model UN</td>
<td>InnMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>International Model UN of Alkmaar</td>
<td>IMUNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>EU25</td>
<td>International Youth Leadership Conference</td>
<td>IYLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAS</td>
<td>EUCA</td>
<td>Istanbul International Model UN</td>
<td>IIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Keele Model UN</td>
<td>KMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Lahn Conference Model UN</td>
<td>LahnMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Leiden University Model UN</td>
<td>LEMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>London International Model UN</td>
<td>LIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Lund Model UN</td>
<td>LUMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Main Model UN</td>
<td>MainMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Mediolamun</td>
<td>Mediolamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Milan International Model UN</td>
<td>MILMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Model UN Alfrink</td>
<td>MUNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Model UN Baden-Wuerttemberg</td>
<td>MUNBW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Model UN Chadle Hulme School</td>
<td>MUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Model UN of Luebeck</td>
<td>MUNOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Model UN of Munich</td>
<td>MunoM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Model UN of Schleswig-Holstein</td>
<td>MUNSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAS</td>
<td>EUCA</td>
<td>Model UN Turkey</td>
<td>MUNTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Modèle Francophone des Nations Unies</td>
<td>MFNU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>NOEU</td>
<td>Moscow International Model UN</td>
<td>MIIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Muenster University International Model UN</td>
<td>MIUMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Munich Model UN</td>
<td>MucMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Nottingham International Model UN</td>
<td>NottsMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>NOEU</td>
<td>Odessa National University Model UN</td>
<td>ONUMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Oldenburg Model UN</td>
<td>OLMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>University Name</td>
<td>Model UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Osnabrück Model UN</td>
<td>OsnaMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Oxford International University Model UN</td>
<td>OxiMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Paris International Model UN</td>
<td>PIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Paris Model UN</td>
<td>PAMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>EU25</td>
<td>Polish Model UN</td>
<td>POLMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Queens University Belfast International Model UN</td>
<td>QUBMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Radboud University Nijmegen</td>
<td>RiMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU25</td>
<td>Riga International Model UN</td>
<td>RIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Rome International Model UN</td>
<td>RIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Saint Louis University Madrid Model UN</td>
<td>SLU Madrid MUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>NOEU</td>
<td>Saint Petersburg International Model UN</td>
<td>SPIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Schueler-Plan Spiel UN</td>
<td>SPUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>EU25</td>
<td>Slovenia International Model UN</td>
<td>SIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>EU27</td>
<td>Sofia International Model UN</td>
<td>SOFIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>St Andrew's International Model UN</td>
<td>SAIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Stockholm Model UN</td>
<td>SMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>The Cultural and Youth Association Model UN, Universidad de Salamanca</td>
<td>MUNUSAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>The European International Model UN</td>
<td>TEIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>The Hague International Model UN</td>
<td>THIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Thessaloniki International Student Model UN</td>
<td>TESSISMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>EU27</td>
<td>Transylvanian International Model UN</td>
<td>TRANSIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAS</td>
<td>EUCA</td>
<td>Turkish International Model UN</td>
<td>TIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>UN International Student Conference Amsterdam</td>
<td>UNISCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Universidade de Coimbra Model UN</td>
<td>MUN-FEUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>EU27</td>
<td>University of Bucharest Model UN</td>
<td>UBMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>University of Essex Model UN</td>
<td>MUNEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>University of Sussex Model UN</td>
<td>USMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Uppsala Model UN</td>
<td>UMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Vienna International Historic Model UN</td>
<td>HISTOMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Vienna International Model UN</td>
<td>VIMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>NOEU</td>
<td>Yaroslavl International Model UN</td>
<td>YarMUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEU</td>
<td>EUCA</td>
<td>Zagreb International Model UN</td>
<td>ZAGIMUN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Questionnaire A (organizers)

Model UN Conference research - Organizers

This questionnaire seeks to collect information about the organizers of Model UN conferences.

Legend:
1) Academic Preparation: Topic selection, Rules of Procedure, Guest Speakers etc.
2) Finances: Budget, accounting, reimbursements, etc.
3) Fundraising: Sponsor relations, grants & other external sources of revenues
4) IT (Information Techn.): Website and other information technology used
5) Logistics: Conference venue, Catering, Accommodation etc.
6) Participant Management: Registration, Selection, Participant relations etc.
7) Promotion/Marketing: Advertising & promotion of the event with selected target groups
8) Team/Project Management: Coordination & guidance of the people organizing the conference

*Required

Personal Information

Gender *
Please indicate your gender:
- Female
- Male

Year of Birth *
Please select the year in which you were born:

Primary nationality *
What is your primary nationality?

Organization experience *
How many student conferences have you helped to organize? (excl. chairing experiences)

MUN experience *
How many MUN conferences have you attended as participant? (incl. chairing experiences)
Conference Information

If you have contributed to the organization of multiple MUN conferences, please provide only information about the one you were most involved in.

**Name**
What is the name of the conference you work(ed) for? (one only)

**Country**
In which country does this conference take place?

--- PLEASE SELECT ---

**Year of most recent involvement**
In which year were you involved in the organization of this conference? (In case you were involved in the organization of the same conference during multiple years, please select the most recent experience)

- 2009
- 2008
- 2007
- Other: 

**Main responsibility**
Which area is/was your main area of responsibility during the organization of your conference? (more than one answer possible)

- Academic preparation
- Finances
- Fundraising
- IT (website etc)
- Logistics
- Participant management
- Promotion/Marketing
- Team/Project management
Monetary reward *
Were you paid for your work organizing this conference?
- Yes
- No

Team language *
On top of the domestic language, which language is/was commonly spoken in your team?
- English
- French
- Spanish
- German
- Other: ____________

Organizing your conference: Time
In this case "time" means the amount of time spent organizing the conference

Your time investment *
How much time do/did you invest on average in your area of responsibility per week?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- or more hours per week (average)

Team: HIGH TIME intensive areas *
According to the experience of your team, which of the following areas generally take MUCH time when organizing your conference? (max 3 answers)
- Academic preparation
- Finances
- Fundraising
- IT (website etc)
- Logistics
- Participant management
- Promotion / Marketing
- Project/Team management
Team: LOW TIME intensive areas *
According to the experience of your team, which of the following areas generally take LITTLE time when organizing your conference? (max 3 answers)

☐ Academic preparation
☐ Finances
☐ Fundraising
☐ IT (website etc)
☐ Logistics
☐ Participant management
☐ Promotion / Marketing
☐ Project/Team management

Organizing your conference: Challenge
Definition of "challenge": anything, such as a demanding task, that calls for special effort or dedication

Team: CHALLENGING areas *
According to the experience of your team, which of the following areas are generally challenging to organize? (max 3 answers)

☐ Academic preparation
☐ Finances
☐ Fundraising
☐ IT (website etc)
☐ Logistics
☐ Participant management
☐ Promotion / Marketing
☐ Project/Team management

Team: EASY areas *
According to the experience of your team, which of the following areas are generally NOT challenging to organize? (max 3 answers)

☐ Academic preparation
☐ Finances
☐ Fundraising
☐ IT (website etc)
☐ Logistics
☐ Participant management
☐ Promotion / Marketing
☐ Project/Team management
Personal challenge
Did you have to develop new skills to master your area of responsibility?

1 2 3 4 5

No ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Yes

External advice

Definition of "external advice": contributions to the organization of your conference not originating from the members of the core team originally charged with the organization.

External advice
Does/did your conference receive external advice?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If yes: Received external advice
In which of the following areas does/did your conference receive external advice? (more than one answer possible)

☐ Academic preparation
☐ Finances
☐ Fundraising
☐ IT (website etc)
☐ Logistics
☐ Participant management
☐ Promotion / Marketing
☐ Project/Team management

If yes: Source of external advice
Who provided(ed) the external advice? (more than one answer possible)

☐ Academic Faculty
☐ Former organizers available locally
☐ Former organizers NOT available locally
☐ Business
☐ Other: ____________________________

If yes: Usefulness of external advice
How is/was the overall usefulness of the external advice received?

1 2 3 4 5

Low ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ High
External advice: Desired *
In which of the following areas would you like to receive external advice? (more than one answer possible)

☐ Academic preparation
☐ Finances
☐ Fundraising
☐ IT (website etc)
☐ Logistics
☐ Participant management
☐ Promotion / Marketing
☐ Project/Team management

Final questions

Overall satisfaction *
Were you satisfied with the overall organization of your conference?

1 2 3 4 5

Low ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ High

Interview availability *
Please provide your email address in the "Other:" box below if you are available for an additional interview (example@gmail.com)

☐ No
☐ Other: ____________________________

Comments
Please feel free to add further comments here


Data protection *

☐ I hereby authorize the handling and processing of personal information in accordance with the data-protection and privacy regulations laid down by Italian Legislative Decree No. 196 of 30/06/03, or according to respective local legislation.
Annex 3: Questionnaire B (conference details)

Model UN Conference research - Annual details

This questionnaire seeks to collect detailed information about Model UN conferences on an annual basis. Please feel free to take fill this questionnaire out multiple times if you have the annual details of more than two years for a conference.

Definition of in-kind contribution: A non-monetary contribution. It can be in the form of infrastructure support, office supplies support, equipment support etc.

*Required

General Information about the conference

Name *
What is the name of the conference?

Country *
In which country does the conference take place?

Founding year *
In which year was the conference founded / first held?

Incorporation *
Is the entity organizing the conference incorporated or registered in any way? (more than one answer possible)

- Not registered or incorporated
- Registered with a university (e.g. student group)
- Incorporated as Non-Profit Organization
- Incorporated as Foundation
- Incorporated as For-Profit Organization

Year of incorporation
In case the entity organizing the conference is incorporated, in which year did that happen?
Language *
What is the official language of the conference? (more than one answer possible)

- [ ] English
- [ ] French
- [ ] Russian
- [ ] Spanish
- [ ] German
- [ ] Other: 

Frequency *
How many times is the conference usually held per year?

1 2 3 4 5 6

- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5
- [ ] 6
- [ ] or more time(s) per year

Conference details #1
Please provide details of the most recent edition of the conference you have information on:

Year: conference #1
In which year did this edition of the conference take place?

- [ ] 2009
- [ ] 2008
- [ ] 2007
- [ ] Other: 

Size
How many participants attended the conference that year? (incl. chairs and staff)


Duration
How many days did the conference last that year?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5
- [ ] 6
- [ ] 7
- [ ] 8
- [ ] 9
- [ ] 10
- [ ] or more days or more

Core organization team
How many people were involved in the organization of the conference that year? (please only count those who contributed more than 4h per week on average)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5
- [ ] 6
- [ ] 7
- [ ] 8
- [ ] 9
- [ ] 10
- [ ] or more
Standard participation fee
How much was the standard participation fee charged that year? (in €)

Budget
How much was the budget (excl. in-kind contributions) of the conference that year? (in €)
- less than 15,000 €
- 15,001 - 20,000 €
- 20,001 - 25,000 €
- 25,001 - 35,000 €
- 35,001 - 45,000 €
- 45,001 - 60,000 €
- 60,001 - 80,000 €
- Other: __________

In-kind contributions received
Did the conference receive some form of in-kind contributions that year? (more than one answer possible)
- Conference venue
- Catering
- Accommodation
- Office supplies
- Technical equipment
- IT support
- Merchandise

Cash sponsors
How many sponsors providing CASH did the conference have that year?

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sponsor contribution
How much did the sponsors contribute to the budget (excl. in-kind contributions) that year? (in %)
- 0 - 20%
- 20 - 40%
- 40 - 60%
- 60 - 80%
- Other: __________
Conference details #2

If you are able to, please provide details of a second edition of the conference you have information on:

Year: conference #2
In which year did this edition of the conference take place?

☐ 2008
☐ 2007
☐ 2006
☐ Other: ____________________________

[Repeated questions of above section “Conference details #1”: Size, Duration, Core organization team, Standard participation fee, Budget, In-kind contributions received, Cash sponsors, Sponsor contribution]

Data protection *

☐ I hereby authorize the handling and processing of personal information in accordance with the data protection and privacy regulations laid down by Italian Legislative Decree No. 196 of 30/06/03, or according to respective local legislation.

Comments
Please leave any further comments here:

Submit
Nr.1  FAQ Europa  
Robert Menasse

Nr.2  Für ein Europa der Bürgerinnen und Bürger  
Rupert Graf Strachwitz

Nr.3  Erinnern für die Zukunft  
Auf dem Weg zu einer europäischen Erinnerungskultur  
Christian Schreier

Nr.4  Migratory Trends in the Mediterranean  
Socio-Economic Challenges and Pressure on Italy and Europe  
Maurizio Mastrolembo Ventura, Carla Collicelli and Monica Altieri

Nr.5  The Market for Model United Nations Conferences in Geographical Europe  
Market Research  
K. Victor Henckel von Donnersmarck

URN: urn:nbn:0243-102013ebu057  
ISSN: 2197-6821