

1. What area are you from?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Asia		6.5%	16
Europe		29.0%	71
Middle East		1.2%	3
North America		56.3%	138
Africa		1.2%	3
Latin America/Caribbean		4.1%	10
Australia/New Zealand/Oceania		1.6%	4
answered question			245
skipped question			1






2. Approximately how many IETF meetings have you attended (including this one)?

		Response Percent	Response Count
1		8.2%	20
2 - 5		17.2%	42
6 - 10		15.2%	37
11 - 19		18.9%	46
>20		40.6%	99
answered question			244
skipped question			2




3. Are you (check all that apply.)

		Response Percent	Response Count
IESG member	<input type="checkbox"/>	3.6%	6
IAB member	<input type="checkbox"/>	3.6%	6
IRSG Member	<input type="checkbox"/>	3.0%	5
IAOC-Trust member		0.0%	0
Nomcom member	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.8%	3
Working Group chair	<input type="checkbox"/>	33.9%	56
Author of active working group draft	<input type="checkbox"/>	68.5%	113
Author of active individual submission draft	<input type="checkbox"/>	67.9%	112
Full Time Student	<input type="checkbox"/>	4.8%	8
answered question			165
skipped question			81




4. When were you born?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Before 1950		5.4%	13
1950 - 1960		16.9%	41
1961 - 1970		31.0%	75
1971 - 1980		33.9%	82
1981 - 1990		12.8%	31
After 1990		0.0%	0
answered question			242
skipped question			4





5. Did you attend IETF 88 in Vancouver?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, on a Day Pass		1.6%	4
Yes		97.2%	239
No		1.2%	3
answered question			246
skipped question			0



6. What is the OS of your meeting computer?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Windows		38.1%	91
Mac OS		46.0%	110
Linux		15.9%	38
	Other (please specify)		11
answered question			239
skipped question			7



7. How long did your travel to the meeting take?

		Response Percent	Response Count
< 5 hours		20.6%	49
5 to 10 hours		31.1%	74
11 to 20 hours		38.2%	91
> 20 hours		10.1%	24
answered question			238
skipped question			8








8. Did you have to apply for a visa to attend IETF 88?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		8.0%	19
No		92.0%	219
answered question			238
skipped question			8

9. Which hotel did you stay in?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Hyatt		71.9%	128
Fairmont		28.1%	50
Other (please specify)			57
answered question			178
skipped question			68



10. Why did you elect to stay at this hotel? (Pick all that apply).

		Response Percent	Response Count
Socialize with other attendees		39.4%	87
IETF Internet		35.7%	79
Convenience/proximity to venue		77.4%	171
Price		43.0%	95
Corporate travel agency requirement/recommendation		10.9%	24
Unavailability of first option		3.6%	8
Hotel awards program points		10.4%	23
	Other (please specify)		19

answered question 221

skipped question 25

11. Would you want the Vancouver Hyatt used as an IETF meeting venue in the future?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		91.3%	209
No		8.7%	20
	Comments		60

answered question 229

skipped question 17

12. How would you rate the wireless service, the NOC, help desk and terminal room.

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	N/A	Rating Average	Rating Count
Wireless	0.4% (1)	0.4% (1)	7.2% (17)	26.0% (61)	65.1% (153)	0.9% (2)	4.56	235
NOC	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.4% (1)	5.7% (13)	30.3% (69)	63.6% (145)	4.82	228
Help Desk	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.4% (1)	7.0% (16)	14.9% (34)	77.6% (177)	4.65	228
Terminal Room	0.0% (0)	0.9% (2)	1.7% (4)	14.0% (32)	18.8% (43)	64.6% (148)	4.43	229
Lounge on 34th Floor	0.0% (0)	0.9% (2)	5.3% (12)	13.3% (30)	15.0% (34)	65.5% (148)	4.23	226
						Comments		30
						answered question		235
						skipped question		11

13. The IAOC uses survey results in its evaluation of the meeting venue's performance. How would you rate the following?

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	N/A	Rating Average	Rating Count
Internet service in my hotel room	1.7% (4)	5.2% (12)	9.4% (22)	26.2% (61)	37.8% (88)	19.7% (46)	4.16	233
Meeting facilities	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	7.4% (17)	36.8% (85)	52.8% (122)	3.0% (7)	4.47	231
Hotel Staff	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.5% (8)	35.7% (82)	52.6% (121)	8.3% (19)	4.54	230
Food and beverage	0.9% (2)	3.0% (7)	20.8% (48)	45.0% (104)	28.1% (65)	2.2% (5)	3.99	231
							Comments	28
							answered question	233
							skipped question	13

14. How would you rate the following?

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	N/A	Rating Average	Rating Count
Audio visual equipment	0.0% (0)	0.9% (2)	6.9% (16)	47.4% (110)	41.4% (96)	3.4% (8)	4.34	232
Power strips availability	0.9% (2)	4.7% (11)	22.4% (52)	41.4% (96)	27.6% (64)	3.0% (7)	3.93	232
Secretariat staff	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.9% (2)	14.7% (34)	58.4% (135)	26.0% (60)	4.78	231
Registration experience	0.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.3% (3)	20.1% (47)	77.8% (182)	0.4% (1)	4.76	234
Letter of Invitation handling	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.4% (10)	11.4% (26)	84.3% (193)	4.72	229
Visa processing	0.4% (1)	1.3% (3)	1.3% (3)	2.7% (6)	4.4% (10)	89.8% (202)	3.91	225
						Comments		14
						answered question		234
						skipped question		12

15. How would you rate the Bits-N-Bites event Thursday night?

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Rating Average	Rating Count
Exhibits	0.0% (0)	3.8% (6)	22.2% (35)	55.7% (88)	18.4% (29)	3.89	158
Food & Beverage	0.0% (0)	0.6% (1)	8.3% (13)	51.0% (80)	40.1% (63)	4.31	157
Event Space	0.0% (0)	3.2% (5)	17.8% (28)	54.8% (86)	24.2% (38)	4.00	157
Comments & Suggestions							48
answered question							159
skipped question							87

16. The EDU Team arranged for the following classes during the meeting. Were these classes useful to you?

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	N/A	Rating Average	Rating Count
Newcomers Training	0.0% (0)	0.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.9% (2)	6.9% (15)	91.7% (199)	4.72	217
Intro to Real Time Applications and Infrastructure Development	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.4% (3)	2.8% (6)	3.3% (7)	92.6% (199)	4.25	215
IETF Tools Training	0.0% (0)	0.5% (1)	1.8% (4)	2.8% (6)	3.7% (8)	91.2% (198)	4.11	217
Wireless Links; properties, challenges, solutions and applications	0.0% (0)	0.9% (2)	0.5% (1)	5.1% (11)	5.1% (11)	88.3% (189)	4.24	214
Suggestions for Future Tutorials							12	
answered question							220	
skipped question							26	

17. How do you rate the Wednesday Plenaries? Technical - Hardening the Internet See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oV71hhEpQ20>

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	N/A	Rating Average	Rating Count
Technical	0.4% (1)	1.3% (3)	6.9% (16)	32.0% (74)	52.4% (121)	6.9% (16)	4.45	231
Comments & Suggestions								31
Administrative	0.5% (1)	1.0% (2)	12.4% (25)	32.3% (65)	19.9% (40)	33.8% (68)	4.06	201
Comments & Suggestions								9
answered question								231
skipped question								15

18. Other than improving the quality of the beer, what improvements can we make to Bits-N-Bites to bring more value to attendees and participants?

	Response Count
	50
answered question	50
skipped question	196

19. How would you rate audio streaming, jabber and Meetecho in support of your participation?

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Rating Average	Rating Count
Audio Streaming	2.6% (3)	1.7% (2)	13.7% (16)	56.4% (66)	25.6% (30)	4.01	117
Jabber	2.3% (3)	3.8% (5)	14.3% (19)	54.9% (73)	24.8% (33)	3.96	133
Meetecho	0.9% (1)	2.6% (3)	18.4% (21)	44.7% (51)	33.3% (38)	4.07	114

Comments 42

answered question 138

skipped question 108

20. The Plenaries were transcribed and available online in real time. If you used the transcription would you describe it as helpful?

	Did Not Use	Not Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	Rating Average	Rating Count
	69.0% (120)	1.1% (2)	16.1% (28)	13.8% (24)	1.75	174

How was it helpful? 17

answered question 174

skipped question 72

21. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.

	Response Count
	42
answered question	42
skipped question	204


22. Do you plan to attend the following IETF meetings?

	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Uncertain	Likely	Very Likely	Rating Count
IETF 89 London	4.7% (11)	4.3% (10)	9.0% (21)	25.3% (59)	56.7% (132)	233
IETF 90 Toronto	3.0% (7)	0.9% (2)	10.8% (25)	39.2% (91)	46.1% (107)	232
IETF 91 Honolulu	4.8% (11)	7.4% (17)	25.1% (58)	30.3% (70)	32.5% (75)	231
					answered question	234
					skipped question	12

23. If you did not attend IETF 88, why not? (Check all that apply.)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Agenda not relevant		0.0%	0
Expense		0.0%	0
Distance		0.0%	0
Location		0.0%	0
Corporate decision		0.0%	0
Could not get a Visa		100.0%	1
Didn't have information on time to make a decision		0.0%	0
Other (please specify)		0.0%	0
answered question			1
skipped question			245

24. Did you participate in one or more sessions from another location, including another location at the meeting, using the Jabber room and/or audio streaming, and/or Meetecho?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		100.0%	2
No		0.0%	0
answered question			2
skipped question			244

25. How would you rate the audio streaming, Jabber rooms, and Meetecho in support of your participation?

	Did Not Use	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Rating Average	Rating Count
Audio stream	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	5.50	2
Jabber room	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	5.00	1
Meetecho	100.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.00	1
							Comments	0
							answered question	2
							skipped question	244

26. The Plenaries were transcribed and available online in real time. If you used the transcription would you describe it as helpful?

	Did Not Use	Not Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	Rating Average	Rating Count	
	50.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	2.50	2	
						How was it helpful?	0
						answered question	2
						skipped question	244

27. Do you plan to attend the following IETF meetings?

	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Uncertain	No	Likely	Very Likely	Rating Average	Rating Count
IETF 89 London	50.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	3.50	2
IETF 90 Toronto	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	4.50	2
IETF 91 Honolulu	50.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	3.50	2
answered question								2
skipped question								244

Page 2, Q6. What is the OS of your meeting computer?

1	iPad	Nov 26, 2013 3:10 AM
2	IOS 7.0	Nov 25, 2013 8:21 PM
3	FreeBSD	Nov 25, 2013 10:55 AM
4	Which one? had Windows, Mac OS, Linux (Android), ...	Nov 25, 2013 10:25 AM
5	among others (freebsd/mac)	Nov 25, 2013 10:25 AM
6	apple ios (ipad)	Nov 25, 2013 10:10 AM
7	NetBSD, Linux, Windows	Nov 25, 2013 9:35 AM
8	NetBSD	Nov 25, 2013 9:34 AM
9	Android	Nov 25, 2013 9:31 AM
10	UNIX	Nov 25, 2013 8:40 AM
11	Mac, Ubuntu. No Windows in the house since XP.	Nov 25, 2013 8:18 AM

Page 3, Q9. Which hotel did you stay in?

1	Westin	Dec 6, 2013 2:33 PM
2	Residence Inn	Nov 29, 2013 7:31 PM
3	Sutton Place (hotwire.com choice)	Nov 27, 2013 12:18 PM
4	Blue Horizon Hotel	Nov 26, 2013 4:40 AM
5	St. Regis Hotel	Nov 25, 2013 11:10 PM
6	Some suites down on Robson	Nov 25, 2013 9:50 PM
7	Renaissance Vancouver Hotel Harbourside	Nov 25, 2013 7:52 PM
8	External	Nov 25, 2013 7:15 PM
9	Century Plaza Hotel and Spa	Nov 25, 2013 7:15 PM
10	Le Soleil (recommend it, very cheap, close, nice)	Nov 25, 2013 5:47 PM
11	Marriott Pinnacle	Nov 25, 2013 4:48 PM
12	Residences on Georgia	Nov 25, 2013 4:25 PM
13	Blue Horizon Hotel	Nov 25, 2013 3:26 PM
14	Airbnb	Nov 25, 2013 2:51 PM
15	Delta	Nov 25, 2013 1:20 PM
16	Stayed at home; attended remotely.	Nov 25, 2013 1:11 PM
17	Hampton Inn	Nov 25, 2013 1:03 PM
18	A vacation timeshare near the Hyatt	Nov 25, 2013 12:51 PM
19	Century Plaza Hotel	Nov 25, 2013 12:12 PM
20	Century Plaza	Nov 25, 2013 12:10 PM
21	Mariott	Nov 25, 2013 11:38 AM
22	Westin	Nov 25, 2013 11:34 AM
23	Apartment	Nov 25, 2013 11:14 AM
24	Hampton Inn & Suites Downtown Vancouver	Nov 25, 2013 10:49 AM
25	Sheraton	Nov 25, 2013 10:40 AM
26	Victorian Hotel	Nov 25, 2013 10:37 AM
27	Marriott	Nov 25, 2013 10:28 AM

Page 3, Q9. Which hotel did you stay in?

28	comfort inn	Nov 25, 2013 10:04 AM
29	Remote participation	Nov 25, 2013 9:58 AM
30	Hampton Inn & Suites	Nov 25, 2013 9:38 AM
31	Westin	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
32	Sandman Vancouver City	Nov 25, 2013 9:25 AM
33	Quality Inn	Nov 25, 2013 9:24 AM
34	ramada inn	Nov 25, 2013 9:22 AM
35	Airport Hilton	Nov 25, 2013 9:09 AM
36	Marriott Pinnacle	Nov 25, 2013 9:08 AM
37	Sheraton Wall Centre	Nov 25, 2013 8:56 AM
38	Marriott Pinnacle	Nov 25, 2013 8:55 AM
39	Terminal City Club	Nov 25, 2013 8:41 AM
40	The Burrard	Nov 25, 2013 8:23 AM
41	The Burrard Hotel	Nov 25, 2013 8:10 AM
42	Hilton Metrotown	Nov 25, 2013 8:08 AM
43	Greenbrier Hotel, Downtown	Nov 25, 2013 7:57 AM
44	Sheraton Wall Center	Nov 25, 2013 7:52 AM
45	Empire Landmark	Nov 25, 2013 7:44 AM
46	Private	Nov 25, 2013 7:44 AM
47	Marriott Pinnacle	Nov 25, 2013 7:33 AM
48	Executive Vintage Park	Nov 25, 2013 7:24 AM
49	Ramada	Nov 25, 2013 7:23 AM
50	Sheraton	Nov 25, 2013 7:19 AM
51	Metropolitan	Nov 25, 2013 7:17 AM
52	Best Western Plus Downtown Vancouver	Nov 25, 2013 7:14 AM
53	Sheraton	Nov 25, 2013 7:10 AM
54	Blue Horizon Hotel	Nov 25, 2013 7:10 AM

Page 3, Q9. Which hotel did you stay in?

55	moda hotel	Nov 25, 2013 7:06 AM
56	wedgewood	Nov 25, 2013 7:04 AM
57	Hilton	Nov 25, 2013 7:02 AM

Page 3, Q10. Why did you elect to stay at this hotel? (Pick all that apply).

1	kitchen	Nov 29, 2013 7:31 PM
2	hotwire.com	Nov 27, 2013 12:18 PM
3	If it were not for the Hyatt Gold Passport loyalty program, I probably would have stayed elsewhere.	Nov 25, 2013 2:50 PM
4	n/a	Nov 25, 2013 1:11 PM
5	As an IESG, this is the only practical choice.	Nov 25, 2013 12:30 PM
6	Awarded IETF Fellowship , Booked here.	Nov 25, 2013 12:00 PM
7	No need to pack for or plan for weather (mostly); minimize morning hassles (coffee, breakfast)	Nov 25, 2013 11:40 AM
8	I was an IETF Fellow sponsored by ISOC. ISOC made the reservation for me.	Nov 25, 2013 10:45 AM
9	restaurant supposedly accomodating with diet restrictions - which it wasn't.	Nov 25, 2013 10:44 AM
10	Suite with kitchen.	Nov 25, 2013 9:38 AM
11	conference hotel	Nov 25, 2013 9:20 AM
12	Proximity to Airport & Rail (since I was just there for 1 day, I used the rail to get in/out).	Nov 25, 2013 9:09 AM
13	I like to stay outside the IETF venue so that I can "unplug"	Nov 25, 2013 8:41 AM
14	Different than Hyatt. I liked Hyatt, but was also happy to try someplace different. It helped that Fairmont was less expensive.	Nov 25, 2013 8:18 AM
15	I stayed at Hyatt in IETF84, and I realize that the Fairmont was close and comfortable enough for the 88.	Nov 25, 2013 8:07 AM
16	Chooed by the ISOC fellowship program management team	Nov 25, 2013 7:51 AM
17	ISOC Fellowship to the IETF	Nov 25, 2013 7:26 AM
18	Hotwire.com	Nov 25, 2013 7:24 AM
19	breakfast included	Nov 25, 2013 7:04 AM

Page 3, Q11. Would you want the Vancouver Hyatt used as an IETF meeting venue in the future?

1	But not to often, some variation in venues and locations is nice.	Nov 29, 2013 5:17 AM
2	I always try to stay at the IETF hotel, but the elevators were so horrible I'd rather stay elsewhere- I think I can get to my room faster from a neighboring hotel.	Nov 27, 2013 2:43 PM
3	It seems to be a good space, once we found the stairs to the fourth floor. I appreciate that the elevators are a complete disaster: a bunch of studies about smart elevators that I came across applied the technology in apartment buildings which have significantly more stochastic arrival times. I think that the newcomers event was on the 34th floor, which would have required me to use the elevator, but as things turned out, I missed it, so I essentially never had to use the elevator. I did not seek the lounge for this reason either.	Nov 27, 2013 12:18 PM
4	Assuming the elevators are improved.	Nov 27, 2013 10:14 AM
5	Space outside the meeting rooms is cramped and isn't conducive to ad-hoc meetings.	Nov 26, 2013 11:49 AM
6	reprogram the elevator control	Nov 26, 2013 3:15 AM
7	The Hyatt was great (except for the elevators)	Nov 26, 2013 12:37 AM
8	No, unless the IETF is allowed to rewrite the Lift Allocation algorithm. Otherwise the hotel was fine.	Nov 25, 2013 10:01 PM
9	I like the city of Vancouver as a meeting location for many reasons. I'm neutral about which hotel in the city is used.	Nov 25, 2013 7:52 PM
10	Although the elevators suck and it would help if they offered access via the hotel stairs to the 3rd/2nd floors.	Nov 25, 2013 7:38 PM
11	excellent hotel... if they would only fix their damn elevators!	Nov 25, 2013 4:31 PM
12	But please ask them to re-optimize the elevators. If they can't, warn people on the first day to leave themselves the extra 15 minutes it takes to get to the WG sessions.	Nov 25, 2013 3:35 PM
13	I would some place where a good breakfast can be part of the negotiated rate as was done in IETF87 Berlin.	Nov 25, 2013 3:23 PM
14	It's a fine property in a great location.	Nov 25, 2013 2:50 PM
15	The elevator system is too slow.	Nov 25, 2013 1:49 PM
16	not that much working space to work with colleagues on drafts and other papers.	Nov 25, 2013 1:25 PM
17	It was clean, well located, reasonable, had good facilities.	Nov 25, 2013 12:50 PM
18	I did like the hotel, but I think that the way it was laid out on multiple floors did not lend itself as well to ad hoc discussions. I preferred the common corridor similar to what we had in Berlin and Orlando.	Nov 25, 2013 12:30 PM
19	although, nothing against it, nothing really stands out either. Let's call it nominal. A bit of a shortage of places to sit down and talk	Nov 25, 2013 12:13 PM

Page 3, Q11. Would you want the Vancouver Hyatt used as an IETF meeting venue in the future?

20	However, I would avoid the elevators as much as I could.	Nov 25, 2013 12:12 PM
21	Especially if they agree to fix the elevators!	Nov 25, 2013 11:57 AM
22	It's good except for the elevators.	Nov 25, 2013 11:43 AM
23	Would like sponsor to do a social; would like break snacks supplied at a volume corresponding to ACTUAL attendance	Nov 25, 2013 11:40 AM
24	Indifferent	Nov 25, 2013 11:34 AM
25	It's great except for the elevators..	Nov 25, 2013 11:04 AM
26	Except for the despicably slow elevators. :-(Nov 25, 2013 10:58 AM
27	Yes but the lifts were full of issues.	Nov 25, 2013 10:45 AM
28	No opinion	Nov 25, 2013 10:28 AM
29	unless the elevator's algorithm gets fixed, then I would change it to yes	Nov 25, 2013 10:18 AM
30	The hotel was generally good, but they really need to do something about the elevators.	Nov 25, 2013 10:11 AM
31	The venue was extremely convenient.	Nov 25, 2013 10:04 AM
32	If elevator control algorithm is improved....	Nov 25, 2013 9:38 AM
33	It's a fine hotel, with the exception of the elevators. I am not familiar with the alternatives. If there is an alternative that is equally acceptable, but with better elevators, then it would be worth considering that.	Nov 25, 2013 9:38 AM
34	We been here very often, I would prefer a more varied list of locations.	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
35	Selfishly prefer starwood properties. Found the Hyatt's elevators to be painful.	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
36	Let's help them improving the elevator system. ;-)	Nov 25, 2013 9:19 AM
37	Generally, I like it, but the elevators are really a problem	Nov 25, 2013 9:09 AM
38	assuming they fix the elevators	Nov 25, 2013 8:56 AM
39	Elevators were unacceptable. There was no improvement compared to previous Vancouver IETF. Old location at the marina was better (and more scenic).	Nov 25, 2013 8:55 AM
40	more seats and spots for hallway discussions would be helpful. Having sockets near the available seats was great though.	Nov 25, 2013 8:48 AM
41	Some people do not like the elevators, but I was not bothered by this aspect. Anyway, I love Vancouver, and hope we can meet in or around Vancouver again in the future, regardless of the specific hotel choice!	Nov 25, 2013 8:46 AM
42	The elevators are painful, but not fatal. Otherwise, the venue works very well.	Nov 25, 2013 8:42 AM

Page 3, Q11. Would you want the Vancouver Hyatt used as an IETF meeting venue in the future?

43	Meeting facilities are fine. Like the neighborhood and its proximity to good restaurants.	Nov 25, 2013 8:41 AM
44	Sure, but I'd stay in the fairmont again if only to avoid the infamous elevators. The location is great though as are the other facilities.	Nov 25, 2013 8:31 AM
45	Oh those elevators.	Nov 25, 2013 8:17 AM
46	The hotel is not very well suited to the typical IETF "traffic pattern". * The elevator system is unfit for a resident conference this size. * Gym was unusable, pool was laughable. Both are needed to keep yourself for 5 days in a working order while under the influence of 10 hour jet-lag. * Bar and restaurant was so-so. Granted vancouver has plenty of alternative options to eat so this was not a problem.	Nov 25, 2013 7:59 AM
47	but please get them to address the slow elevators	Nov 25, 2013 7:53 AM
48	It is ok as the meeting venue. Prices are to high during the summer season.	Nov 25, 2013 7:50 AM
49	it depends on what is asked, I think the hotel we had before Hyatt was a better alternative	Nov 25, 2013 7:45 AM
50	... but they HAVE to fix those stupid elevators ... ;-)	Nov 25, 2013 7:43 AM
51	Not much of areas for side-meetings and conversations around IETF. You're either in the sessions or at your room. A lot of stuff at IETF happening when you talk with people on side meetings. Few chairs in lobbies are available only. Elevators are not sufficient for the demand.	Nov 25, 2013 7:39 AM
52	Hotel is OK but it's kind of hard to navigate	Nov 25, 2013 7:33 AM
53	they so need to fix those elevators.	Nov 25, 2013 7:18 AM
54	Although another hotel in Vancouver may be equal	Nov 25, 2013 7:12 AM
55	The elevator system needs to be made more user friendly. At least: - Less 'taps' to select any room. - Direct buttons for meeting room floors.	Nov 25, 2013 7:11 AM
56	The staff was really helpful, and though the elevator was bad it didn't really have a huge impact on the meetings.	Nov 25, 2013 7:10 AM
57	Yes, but. It is very expensive.	Nov 25, 2013 7:09 AM
58	expensive	Nov 25, 2013 7:06 AM
59	I have nothing against the hotel, but I'm not a fan of going to the same place again and again and again.	Nov 25, 2013 7:04 AM
60	if breakfast is included, then ok	Nov 25, 2013 7:04 AM

Page 3, Q12. How would you rate the wireless service, the NOC, help desk and terminal room.

1	I had some issue with eduroam. Not sure why, but my setup has been working before and after the IETF.	Dec 6, 2013 2:33 PM
2	never used the lounge due to nomcom business and elevator. Nomcom room was very nice, but we couldn't see the doorway to know who was coming in.	Nov 27, 2013 12:18 PM
3	Wifi was *awesome* until Thursday. Then it went to heck.	Nov 25, 2013 7:37 PM
4	What lounge on the 34th floor?	Nov 25, 2013 4:48 PM
5	Did not know there was a lounge on the 34th floor.	Nov 25, 2013 1:49 PM
6	wireless in fairmont hotel was unusable during ietf, and fine two days after ietf. Lounge area was not well advertised, not sure if it had enough seating	Nov 25, 2013 12:13 PM
7	Never went to the 34th floor; never needed the NOC	Nov 25, 2013 12:12 PM
8	What was the lounge on 34th floor for? I didn't know about it.	Nov 25, 2013 11:48 AM
9	Wireless was bad-to-unusable at the beginning of the morning plenary, but the NOC staff fixed it very responsively.	Nov 25, 2013 11:43 AM
10	Best Help Desk is one you don't need (ditto NOC and Terminal Room)	Nov 25, 2013 11:40 AM
11	Did not know we had a lounge on the 34th floor....	Nov 25, 2013 11:12 AM
12	Excellent Lounge on 34th floor	Nov 25, 2013 10:39 AM
13	For some reason there was some difficulty with the network on my sleeping room floor, floor 11...	Nov 25, 2013 10:17 AM
14	In spite of obvious effort, there was some wireless saturation.	Nov 25, 2013 10:04 AM
15	Lounge on 34th floor was too noisy for group meetings. Not a big problem, though. We went to my hotel room in the Hyatt.	Nov 25, 2013 9:56 AM
16	Wireless was unusable during the Technical Plenary.	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
17	wireless worked most of the time (except during one session); didn't use any of the other services	Nov 25, 2013 9:26 AM
18	Meeting room wireless was great, the 34th floor lounge was not as good.	Nov 25, 2013 9:09 AM
19	terminal room was hard to find, too far from meeting rooms and very small	Nov 25, 2013 8:48 AM
20	The 34th floor lounge was nice, but was a bit too far out of the way and there was not enough notice that it was available.	Nov 25, 2013 8:42 AM
21	I was unaware of the lounge on the 34th floor until taking this survey! I can agree that 34 seems cool, but it's probably too far from the action. As I recall, the last time at this hotel, the lounge was on the same level as the terminal room, which made it more accessible.	Nov 25, 2013 8:41 AM
22	Did not know about the 34th floor. Had no reason to call on the NOC. Wireless	Nov 25, 2013 8:25 AM

Page 3, Q12. How would you rate the wireless service, the NOC, help desk and terminal room.

was excellent.

23	Elevator issues made using the 34th floor lounge inconvenient. The lounge itself was fine.	Nov 25, 2013 8:04 AM
24	Worst wireless experience I've encountered at any IETF hotel so far; only the Hotel wireless was usable outside the meeting rooms even though the IETF SSIDs were present everywhere. Several dropouts during the meeting - although plenary was obvious there were several others.	Nov 25, 2013 7:49 AM
25	Would prefer more and smaller table for one-on-one meetings at 34th floor (or elsewhere). Such meetings are an important part of conference life.	Nov 25, 2013 7:43 AM
26	Wireless service was somewhat spotty this time around, strange low signal/nonroaming and choppy throughput.	Nov 25, 2013 7:33 AM
27	The terminal room was a bit cold.	Nov 25, 2013 7:24 AM
28	The lounge would require more power outlets, otherwise very nice.	Nov 25, 2013 7:17 AM
29	The wireless was probably excellent given the circumstances, but it wasn't very stable.	Nov 25, 2013 7:10 AM
30	I think we did a bad job of advertising the lounge, and the elevators made it inaccessible	Nov 25, 2013 7:09 AM

Page 3, Q13. The IAOC uses survey results in its evaluation of the meeting venue's performance. How would you rate the following?

1	Elevators were horrible!!	Nov 27, 2013 2:43 PM
2	The setup in the coordidors and hallways during breaks was resulting in congestion in the hallways.	Nov 27, 2013 10:14 AM
3	Breakfasts and breaks were rapidly running out of food	Nov 26, 2013 3:50 AM
4	more bagel toasters for breakfast would be fine	Nov 26, 2013 3:15 AM
5	BC wine is not as good as Ontario and Nova Scotia wines, but I nonetheless appreciated trying it.	Nov 26, 2013 12:37 AM
6	The free wifi at the Fairmont on the IETF rate was a service that injects an iframe with Fairmont ads and other info around every non-HTTPS destination. Extremely annoying.	Nov 25, 2013 9:36 PM
7	Breakfast was a bit boring, but I suppose that is unavoidable. :-/	Nov 25, 2013 3:26 PM
8	(hotel was Delta)	Nov 25, 2013 1:20 PM
9	Seemed that the rooms were quite cramped for some of the sessions.	Nov 25, 2013 12:30 PM
10	I especially liked the availability of protein and vegetables during the breaks and breakfast.	Nov 25, 2013 12:12 PM
11	There seemed to be fewer tables in the meeting rooms than at previous IETFs.	Nov 25, 2013 12:07 PM
12	Food tended to run out very quickly, especially at breakfasts when I was delayed by the elevators. It was better later in the week than earlier. It would also be nice to have the Thursday ice cream, but I understand that that needs a sponsor.	Nov 25, 2013 11:43 AM
13	Coffee should be non-stop (wasn't); Hotel Staff should not aggregate remainders (e.g. bagels put around one toaster instead of being kept near the many toaster)	Nov 25, 2013 11:40 AM
14	Loved the fresh veggie snacks.	Nov 25, 2013 11:08 AM
15	Always seemed to be a lack of water and some food	Nov 25, 2013 10:28 AM
16	Starting the "cash and grab" or whatever it was on Tuesday was a big mistake. Once people are used to getting their food somewhere, they will keep doing it. Having established other habits on Monday, of course demand was poor for this new service starting Tuesday. Whoever suggested starting Tuesday (most likely the hotel), must not have been serious about really wanting to provide that service.	Nov 25, 2013 10:17 AM
17	Great location and Internet. Lots of informal meeting space. Elevators slow but that always happens. We have big surges of elevator demand.	Nov 25, 2013 9:56 AM
18	limited variety of food at breakfast, breaks, receptions. Also, most conference chairs are uncomfortable, but this hotel's chairs are exceptionally uncomfortable for tall folks.	Nov 25, 2013 8:56 AM

Page 3, Q13. The IAOC uses survey results in its evaluation of the meeting venue's performance. How would you rate the following?

19	Getting tea and food for breakfast was a struggle. I took 4 of the 5 breakfasts at the Starbucks. A better balance with the food available in coffee breaks would be nice.	Nov 25, 2013 8:48 AM
20	Breakfast was so so. Also the nasty artificially sweetened yogurt was really gross. Y U no serve plain yogurt (and by plain I mean plain, no sweeteners or flavorings).	Nov 25, 2013 8:31 AM
21	Temperature control in the meeting sessions is very poor. Over-aggressive air-conditioning is actively unhealthy...	Nov 25, 2013 8:25 AM
22	My hotel wasn't Hyatt, so I can't evaluate the "Internet service in my hotel room" in terms of evaluating "meeting venue's performance".	Nov 25, 2013 8:07 AM
23	Breakfast supplies ran out early on Weds and Fri, and were basically nonexistent/rubbish on Monday. Drinks kept being cleared away rapidly and not giving chances to pick up before attending sessions if you were running a bit late.	Nov 25, 2013 7:49 AM
24	In Fairmont, the pop-up banners inviting to a network service upgrade were annoying.	Nov 25, 2013 7:24 AM
25	Breakfast seemed woefully missing when I looked ay 8:30 am on first day.	Nov 25, 2013 7:12 AM
26	Elevators often seemed slow.	Nov 25, 2013 7:12 AM
27	Quantity of food was short for breakfast (I arrived a 8:55 one morning and the only food remaining was fruits).	Nov 25, 2013 7:11 AM
28	Meeting facilities: elevators issue.	Nov 25, 2013 7:06 AM

Page 3, Q14. How would you rate the following?

1	The laptop for registration is a security risk, are you kidding, anyone can plug a USB and the form is to enter your credit card...	Nov 25, 2013 12:34 PM
2	Power strips seemed a little bit sparser than at some earlier meetings, especially toward the back of the room.	Nov 25, 2013 11:43 AM
3	There could be more tables in the front of the meeting rooms if possible. Everybody is using laptops and it is easier to use laptops if you can put them on the table. In most rooms there were only 1 or 2 rows of tables in the front, and quite often all of them were already full when you get to the meeting room. It would be more useful to have more rows in the front with tables, as most of the meeting rooms were not packed full with people anyways.	Nov 25, 2013 9:39 AM
4	The secretariat is fantastic. AMS should stand for Awesome Meeting Services!	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
5	Almost a complete lack of gluten-free food. Fruit isn't always suitable, especially if it will leave hands messy which are needed to shake hands, deal with laptops, etc. And one gets tired of eating fruit at every break. And knowing how much hotels charge for that crap and how much it must impact the meeting fees, it's annoying to be paying for food that I can't eat.	Nov 25, 2013 9:24 AM
6	Not the best sound we ever had in meeting room, usually better.	Nov 25, 2013 9:19 AM
7	power strips were a little sparse this time, plenty of times when there were seats with no power strips in reach of my laptop cord	Nov 25, 2013 8:56 AM
8	I'm always amazed that a community of geeks is so bad at using lapel mic technology. Could we issue guidelines? (e.g., "lapel mics are designed to be sensitive; please clip them to your chest: do not hold them to your lips!")	Nov 25, 2013 8:25 AM
9	The video projector in one of the smaller rooms was, at least on Monday, of very very bad quality. This may have been fixed afterwards (I'm not sure I had to follow a WG in this room later in the week).	Nov 25, 2013 8:19 AM
10	Visa processing is very hard and tough for Canada. I even asked for a multi-entry and it was only granted for a few months, making it unapplicable for next meeting in Toronto.	Nov 25, 2013 8:07 AM
11	Visa costs too much	Nov 25, 2013 7:51 AM
12	Last time we were in this hotel the power strips were everywhere. This time it was dreadful.	Nov 25, 2013 7:49 AM
13	Projectors seemed a bit dim and fuzzy, in general. Some worse than others.	Nov 25, 2013 7:33 AM
14	More power strips in the meeting rooms, please! There was often just one in the center of each row of chairs, which meant climbing over people to reach them.	Nov 25, 2013 7:12 AM

Page 3, Q15. How would you rate the Bits-N-Bites event Thursday night?

1	Did not go	Dec 6, 2013 2:33 PM
2	I opted for a real dinner instead	Dec 5, 2013 4:33 PM
3	Yet again, nerds do not understand how to convey information on poster boards...	Nov 30, 2013 2:52 AM
4	missed it due to nomcom interviews. No N/A on this item.	Nov 27, 2013 12:18 PM
5	didn't attend	Nov 26, 2013 10:57 AM
6	more room	Nov 26, 2013 12:37 AM
7	I felt the room was narrow.	Nov 25, 2013 11:10 PM
8	the room was slightly too small and was really crowded and noisy sometimes	Nov 25, 2013 10:01 PM
9	more demoes!	Nov 25, 2013 9:50 PM
10	Didn't attend	Nov 25, 2013 7:52 PM
11	No "n/a"?	Nov 25, 2013 7:37 PM
12	missed it, so no comment	Nov 25, 2013 5:47 PM
13	Did not attend	Nov 25, 2013 4:48 PM
14	Free beer was a nice touch. ;)	Nov 25, 2013 3:26 PM
15	None of the exhibits was of my interest. The space was clearly not enough, I was bumping into people with backpacks and plates on their hands all the time.	Nov 25, 2013 2:44 PM
16	unattended	Nov 25, 2013 2:25 PM
17	Did not attend.	Nov 25, 2013 1:49 PM
18	More time in advanced is preferred.	Nov 25, 2013 1:03 PM
19	The area around the exhibits was congested (as was the whole room). This made it a bit less desirable to spend a lot of time with the exhibits.	Nov 25, 2013 12:51 PM
20	I did not attend	Nov 25, 2013 12:50 PM
21	I like the bits and bites more and more. To socialize, to learn something new, to close a couple of action items, and for the leadership team availabilities	Nov 25, 2013 12:30 PM
22	i never find exhibits match anything useful for me. might be personal	Nov 25, 2013 12:13 PM
23	The ratio of tables to attendees could be higher to make it easier.	Nov 25, 2013 12:07 PM
24	Exhibits were a little dull, but that's not something the IAOC has control over.	Nov 25, 2013 11:43 AM
25	Always too crowded & loud :-(Nov 25, 2013 11:40 AM

Page 3, Q15. How would you rate the Bits-N-Bites event Thursday night?

26	Did not attend	Nov 25, 2013 11:07 AM
27	I didn't go.	Nov 25, 2013 11:04 AM
28	could not attend	Nov 25, 2013 10:57 AM
29	With limited exhibits and many people the exhibits were difficult to approach.	Nov 25, 2013 10:49 AM
30	N/A, was out on personal business Thursday night.	Nov 25, 2013 10:37 AM
31	While there were a reasonable number of exhibits, they seemed dwarfed by the huge crowded room...	Nov 25, 2013 10:17 AM
32	still not enough exhibits to justify the event	Nov 25, 2013 10:11 AM
33	Didn't make it this time.	Nov 25, 2013 9:56 AM
34	BnB provides a nice balance between "trade show bling" and showing real work. Having the space for the entire week to setup was excellent. Would like to see more emphasis on IETF-based protocol interop and development, perhaps some unpaid space for WG-related activity via some review process?	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
35	People should test their presentations before bringing them to BnB.	Nov 25, 2013 9:31 AM
36	a little crowded; but good	Nov 25, 2013 9:26 AM
37	exhibits were too close together, made it difficult to move through them	Nov 25, 2013 8:56 AM
38	Could not attend, unfortunately	Nov 25, 2013 8:25 AM
39	I couldn't attend.	Nov 25, 2013 8:07 AM
40	There were not enough compagnies in the exhibits	Nov 25, 2013 7:51 AM
41	Impressed. Although the raffle was a joke!	Nov 25, 2013 7:49 AM
42	Sorry, could not find tme to attend.	Nov 25, 2013 7:45 AM
43	Small room	Nov 25, 2013 7:44 AM
44	I didn't attend	Nov 25, 2013 7:40 AM
45	Couldn't attend	Nov 25, 2013 7:10 AM
46	Did not attend.	Nov 25, 2013 7:08 AM
47	I was there too short to check out the exhibits, so it would be good to include N/A in this question too	Nov 25, 2013 7:04 AM
48	need more hot vegetables	Nov 25, 2013 7:04 AM

Page 3, Q16. The EDU Team arranged for the following classes during the meeting. Were these classes useful to you?

1	I think that the WG chairs lunch should be used less for technology introductions, and more for tools training.	Nov 27, 2013 12:18 PM
2	didn't attend	Nov 26, 2013 10:57 AM
3	TLS and DTLS use in protocols	Nov 25, 2013 7:52 PM
4	webex	Nov 25, 2013 12:30 PM
5	The wireless session would have been useful, but I was occupied with family business	Nov 25, 2013 10:37 AM
6	I can't comment on the Wireless Links presentation since I gave it :-)	Nov 25, 2013 10:17 AM
7	Didn't make it to any of these.	Nov 25, 2013 9:56 AM
8	- Privacy and Security in protocol development. - Protocol Success (RFC 5218 ++) - Prototyping and developing IETF protocols in Open Source	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
9	I wanted to attend both the IETF Tools Training and the Wireless Link class - but due to personal/corporate conflicts, could not attend the IETF meeting that day. Maybe next time.	Nov 25, 2013 9:09 AM
10	it will be better to send thes tutorials to newcomers before the meeting	Nov 25, 2013 7:51 AM
11	I usually go to several EDU sessions, just not this time.	Nov 25, 2013 7:19 AM
12	Couldn't attend Newcomers Training due to meetings already on sunday. Would very much like to attend at a future event.	Nov 25, 2013 7:10 AM

Comments & Suggestions

1	Really enjoyed Bruce's talk	Dec 5, 2013 4:33 PM
2	Mostly platitudes. Very little real substance.	Nov 30, 2013 2:52 AM
3	It was very relevant, I liked that.	Nov 29, 2013 5:17 AM
4	I often feel that the technical plenary fails to come to a clear actionable conclusion.	Nov 27, 2013 12:18 PM
5	plenaries should not be hijacked for political agendas	Nov 26, 2013 10:57 AM
6	Best technical plenary that I can remember.	Nov 26, 2013 12:37 AM
7	Put more care into the design of "hummm" questions so the results are more useful.	Nov 25, 2013 7:52 PM
8	A well framed and reasoned discussion on the issues.	Nov 25, 2013 7:44 PM
9	The main reason that I came, and well worth it.	Nov 25, 2013 2:51 PM
10	Bruce Schneier was sadly mostly security theatre. I hope IETF didn't pay him a giant speaker fee for that. Stephen Farrell was far more useful with his comments	Nov 25, 2013 12:13 PM
12	One of the most interesting & relevant tech plenaries in a long time.	Nov 25, 2013 11:43 AM
13	I liked the plenary in the AM.	Nov 25, 2013 11:04 AM
14	There was high emotional content with very little solution-oriented technical content. It started with multiple assertions presented as fact. The facts themselves (passive collection of unencrypted data) are real, but use cases focused on governmental spying only. Other use cases that could be considered legitimate (ex. organizational inspection for security or data-loss prevention) were shouted down. The "hums" were premature given the limited discussion. It was appropriate to present this problem and I think the actions in the working groups are moving ahead well. The plenary was a bit off-base.	Nov 25, 2013 10:57 AM
15	One sided, "feel good", presentations, no balanced approach, would have been good if someone would have presented the other side of the coin, anti-terrorism etc.	Nov 25, 2013 10:38 AM
17	I actually liked having it in the morning	Nov 25, 2013 10:18 AM
18	With the notable exception of Bruce Schneier, the discussion and polling felt like I was at a bad Jerry Springer show.	Nov 25, 2013 9:38 AM
19	Brian C's historical report was very well done and very important for us to hear, and of course it was nice to get Bruce back again to talk with us. The group humming was a tad leading and a bit awkward though.	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
20	Thanks to Bruce for coming and to Brian and Stephen for their excellent presentations.	Nov 25, 2013 9:31 AM

21	Great and relevant discussion.	Nov 25, 2013 9:26 AM
22	<p>There was a huge missed opportunity to be more introspective. It is always nice to bash government entities (in casu: the alleged backdoor in EC-DRBG). However, this concern had been known since 2007, without anyone caring/acting on this (drafts were just drafts by then). To me, this suggests that IETF people who are now all vivid either did not care to act when they could take the responsibility, or simply do not have the crypto expertise and are easily swayed by others, *without proper vetting*. Lots of protocol designers seem to lack crypto/security expertise to avoid repeating the same mistake over and over again. Meanwhile, even at Vancouver meeting, crypto protocols (e.g., in password-based authentication) are going for last call, lacking security proofs, where the Chair who issues LC simply states in his email "has passed CFRG review with satisfactory result" (which did not include any discussion on cryptographic merit). At the same time, there is lots of TLS traffic re shifting to Brainpool curves, Bernstein's latest, etc., made by the same people who elsewhere in their messages display lack of understanding of the most basic cryptographic knowledge. So, IETF processes also seem ripe for more professional input and should simply preclude inclusion of cryptographic protocols that do not have supporting security analysis (certainly, if there are competing drafts that have these, these should be given preference as BCP). So far for IETF processes. The other aspect missing from discussion is the extremely dubious role played by security vendors: these included crypto protocols for which concern re potential backdoors was expressed all the way back in 2007 into their products and only had a PR figleaf in September this year, running in full damage control mode, to advise customers that they should disable options they had put on themselves *as default mode*, thereby evidencing their own lack of keeping up with cryptographic literature. So, it seems something nefarious is going on there as well -- but not being discussed. Recommendations: 1) IETF should professionalize, in terms of not adopting any protocol that has not been properly vetted by crypto community (no technical paper means not to be considered). While IETF has lots of protocol people, this is something else entirely than knowing about crypto. 2) IETF should not blindly trust products from other entities, whether US Government, academia, or otherwise. See also point #1 {this should have been the case all along, but somehow apparently not} 3) One should really re-examine lots of protocols that are the plumbing of the internet's operation, but are only doing a mediocre job at it. Suffice it to see the recent discussion on TLS vulnerabilities (go to mailing list: "this group is a failure" main thesis: IETF designed in features that were known in the literature to be broken beforehand.</p>	Nov 25, 2013 9:22 AM
23	One of the better ones. Appreciated having Bruce there.	Nov 25, 2013 9:09 AM
24	Again, I wanted to attend, but did not. I have not yet watched the youtube but I do plan to (thanks for recording it).	Nov 25, 2013 9:09 AM
25	While I was one of the ones that suggested including Bruce Schneier after he called IETF out in public, I think his comments were long on bluster and short on substance.	Nov 25, 2013 8:56 AM
28	The panel was a bit like cheer leaders. A more balanced view would have been more professional.	Nov 25, 2013 8:38 AM

Page 3, Q17. How do you rate the Wednesday Plenaries? Technical - Hardening the Internet See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oV71hhEpQ20>

29	Best plenary I've attended. Well done for putting this topic on the agenda, and for providing an environment for mature and constructive debate.	Nov 25, 2013 8:25 AM
30	It was a bit more on the political side than I would have preferred but I still found it interesting. The consensus questions seemed a bit tainted toward questions that seemed a little obvious.	Nov 25, 2013 8:18 AM
32	Hardening the Internet See:I think the political issue should be solved first. This discussion was a joke. As long as people working at the IETF will be paid by the NSA i cannot trust the results on security issues comming from the IETF. Topic missed.	Nov 25, 2013 8:14 AM
33	Didn't say anything new. The discussion in Perpass was far far better.	Nov 25, 2013 7:49 AM
34	I'm biased though:-)	Nov 25, 2013 7:34 AM
35	Interesting stuff.	Nov 25, 2013 7:23 AM
36	Some of the decisions were very high level and vague. It's not quite clear if they are going to lead to any actual change. Nevertheless I guess it was the best we could hope for and I don't blame the IETF.	Nov 25, 2013 7:10 AM
Comments & Suggestions		
5	always a waste of time	Nov 26, 2013 10:57 AM
11	Want to see the NOC report*presented* again... Helps attendees understand some operational stuff...	Nov 25, 2013 11:57 AM
16	please go back to very short admin presentations and slides on-line	Nov 25, 2013 10:29 AM
18	This continues to be necessary, but not highly informative.	Nov 25, 2013 9:38 AM
26	Boring	Nov 25, 2013 8:43 AM
27	The administrative plenary is approaching a good length. The organizers should continue to put pressure on the "reporting" presentations to hit the top few important points and refer the audience to backup material for details.	Nov 25, 2013 8:41 AM
28	Could do without.	Nov 25, 2013 8:38 AM
31	People should have some self-control about having dialogs at the microphones.	Nov 25, 2013 8:17 AM
33	Scrap it.	Nov 25, 2013 7:49 AM

Page 3, Q18. Other than improving the quality of the beer, what improvements can we make to Bits-N-Bites to bring more value to attendees and participants?

1	Require all exhibitors to attend a class on effective presentation skills.	Nov 30, 2013 2:52 AM
2	More hardware demonstrations.	Nov 28, 2013 7:22 PM
3	Having missed this one, sadly, I think the current trend towards more protocol/product/open source demos is the right trend. I did not miss the too-loud, too-hard-to-find-food social event.	Nov 27, 2013 12:18 PM
4	Put posters about exhibitions around registration area prior to Bits-N-Bites will grab more attentions.	Nov 27, 2013 1:42 AM
5	more tables to put the dish on	Nov 26, 2013 3:16 AM
6	Quantity of the beer?	Nov 26, 2013 12:37 AM
7	more demoes	Nov 25, 2013 9:50 PM
8	More exhibitors	Nov 25, 2013 7:44 PM
9	Cancel it.	Nov 25, 2013 4:48 PM
10	I'm not sure this can be made to work. If it's going to be vendors or projects showing something off, they need more space, and the showing should be more interactive. But it's not clear to me what incentive anyone would have for putting forth the effort. If it's just a lighter-weight social event, label it as such and let folks sponsor for logos on a sign...	Nov 25, 2013 3:35 PM
11	It's tricky, since the IETF is explicitly *NOT* a sales event, and people making purchasing decisions don't usually attend. I can't think of many improvements.	Nov 25, 2013 3:26 PM
12	Use a large enough space. The Berlin space was too crowded.	Nov 25, 2013 2:50 PM
13	Backpack storage, or time to go and drop your bag before the event.	Nov 25, 2013 2:44 PM
14	The exhibits/demos are very hard to appreciate against the background noise. Would it be possible to have them in a neighbouring room? Also, encourage poster-only displays for people not quite ready for a BOF or demo.	Nov 25, 2013 1:53 PM
15	Did not attend.	Nov 25, 2013 1:49 PM
16	... a interesting and entertaining general 15 minute talk about an interesting topic. Vancouver: are we really going to encrypt the full internet? Or any other funny talk which is of general interest.	Nov 25, 2013 1:25 PM
17	More time to prepare and test in advance of the event Thursday evening.	Nov 25, 2013 1:03 PM
18	The space was congested. That is fine for socializing, but I think it makes it a bit harder to pay attention to the exhibits.	Nov 25, 2013 12:51 PM
19	Pretty good as it is now.	Nov 25, 2013 12:30 PM
20	The only thing that I think needs to be worked out a bit more is the flow of the room. Seemed difficult to get to the booths due to people standing in front of the	Nov 25, 2013 12:30 PM

Page 3, Q18. Other than improving the quality of the beer, what improvements can we make to Bits-N-Bites to bring more value to attendees and participants?

	booths talking.	
21	It was too crowded - larger space would have allowed for better interaction.	Nov 25, 2013 12:10 PM
22	Deserts too? Bigger physical venue. Invited posters (other than BoF) too (e.g. research). More seating, more standing tables.	Nov 25, 2013 11:40 AM
23	Even more booths if we can find people that want to purchase a table.	Nov 25, 2013 11:22 AM
24	Improve the quality of the wine? Seriously, the ratio of people attending to exhibits to see meant that the exhibits were very crowded and difficult to get close.	Nov 25, 2013 10:49 AM
25	I don't think the IETF can do much. While the event certainly has been accepted by IETFers, it has not been accepted in the market. I don't know when is the time to declare failure, but surely it cannot be far off.	Nov 25, 2013 10:38 AM
26	Clearer signs higher up pointing to the exhibits so you can find them more easily?	Nov 25, 2013 10:17 AM
27	It is a bit crowded and noisy. Be nice if venue was a bit larger to help spread things out a bit.	Nov 25, 2013 10:13 AM
28	More exhibits. Less crowded space.	Nov 25, 2013 10:11 AM
29	N/A	Nov 25, 2013 10:04 AM
30	See above - A non-commercially-sponsored table that, somehow, gets to show off new IETF protocol development. Perhaps done by students, or for cases where there are more than one implementation, etc. Proposals could be collected, selected by appointed committee, etc. I'd be careful not to make this *TOO* good, lest we end up with real marketing budgets stepping in and turning the event into a sales event. The balance is still OK to me right now, so any augmentation should be very gradual, with the ability to rollback at any time.	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
31	Presenters should bear in mind that they are presenting to the IETF and not to a normal audience. The 10g ethernet cable giveaway was absurd; that exhibitor had some cool stuff that I would have liked to see more of.	Nov 25, 2013 9:31 AM
32	not sure - I thought it was good	Nov 25, 2013 9:26 AM
33	More space and more booths	Nov 25, 2013 9:19 AM
34	Bigger space/More tables	Nov 25, 2013 9:02 AM
35	keep up the good work on good quality demonstrations. Technology demonstrations are always more interesting than plain vendor sales tables.	Nov 25, 2013 8:56 AM
36	Desert would be nice...	Nov 25, 2013 8:55 AM
37	Give more space and visibility to demos	Nov 25, 2013 8:48 AM
38	Make it last 3 hours instead of 2 hours.	Nov 25, 2013 8:46 AM

Page 3, Q18. Other than improving the quality of the beer, what improvements can we make to Bits-N-Bites to bring more value to attendees and participants?

39	Improving the *quantity* of beer :-P	Nov 25, 2013 8:38 AM
40	More technically focused exhibits; less marketing centric, although I understand that's how the event gets sponsored/paid for.	Nov 25, 2013 8:18 AM
41	Maybe have some demos on a schedule so people can go from one to another if they are interested. I think food is the draw for many right now as it's another chance to socialize. I don't know too many who go for information.	Nov 25, 2013 8:04 AM
42	Work to bring more companies	Nov 25, 2013 7:51 AM
43	Sorry, did not attend.	Nov 25, 2013 7:45 AM
44	Perhaps allow for a cheaper option for research projects to participate - this might add interesting exhibitions.	Nov 25, 2013 7:45 AM
45	More space. Places to chat. But overall v. good this time so hard to see how to get more space or better places to chat.	Nov 25, 2013 7:34 AM
46	more standing table space	Nov 25, 2013 7:26 AM
47	More information shared before hand about the exhibits etc	Nov 25, 2013 7:24 AM
48	More space at and between displays; each table was very crowded and hard to see.	Nov 25, 2013 7:19 AM
49	Seats	Nov 25, 2013 7:09 AM
50	select a wider range of demo topics, lower the exhibitor price.	Nov 25, 2013 7:06 AM

Page 3, Q19. How would you rate audio streaming, jabber and Meetecho in support of your participation?

1	Did not use	Dec 6, 2013 2:33 PM
2	1) meetecho needs more cameras firmly planted and pointed, and they need to be higher resolution, and it needs better integration into the projector. Perhaps a RPS RFP is imminent. 2) the clip-on microphones are a serious problem, they are never positioned right. Can we just use simpler technology here? 3) can the "room" and "mp3" stream audio gain knobs be clearly marked and control over them turned over to the chairs?	Nov 27, 2013 12:18 PM
3	Jabber loggs need to log JIDs, not only Nick Names.	Nov 27, 2013 10:14 AM
4	I'm still quite new to the IETF but I don't understand why some groups use Etherpad, others Jabber, what is more important of the two,...	Nov 26, 2013 3:16 AM
5	did no use	Nov 26, 2013 3:15 AM
6	Did not use -- or at least wasn't on the Meetecho side of the use.	Nov 26, 2013 12:37 AM
7	didn't use	Nov 25, 2013 9:50 PM
8	This is missing an N/A. As I did not use them I cannot evaluate them.	Nov 25, 2013 7:44 PM
9	No N/A?	Nov 25, 2013 7:37 PM
10	Did not use.	Nov 25, 2013 4:48 PM
11	Didn't use Audio Streaming - answered "good" because I heard no complaints. - next survey should probably offer N/A for this question.	Nov 25, 2013 3:35 PM
12	Didn't use any of these...	Nov 25, 2013 3:24 PM
13	Quite a few sessions had very poor jabber scribing, inadequate for remote users trying to correlate audio with slides.	Nov 25, 2013 1:53 PM
14	only used audio streaming from the hotel room.	Nov 25, 2013 1:49 PM
15	Meetecho has improved. Jabber success depends upon in-room participation. Audio streaming is generally good, although mics are sometimes not on. A way to identify the speaker-at-the-mic would be very useful.	Nov 25, 2013 1:11 PM
16	I did not use any of these facilities.	Nov 25, 2013 12:50 PM
17	I like the jabber team, but I have to admit that this is not at all at the webex level. The only plus is the live camera.	Nov 25, 2013 12:30 PM
18	don't know, i did not use these services, missing N/A option so selected fair	Nov 25, 2013 12:13 PM
19	I did not use any of these during the meeting. If I were unable to attend, they would be vital to my participation.	Nov 25, 2013 12:12 PM
20	NA	Nov 25, 2013 11:57 AM
21	N/A for Meetecho; Category for rating for slides (Very Good).	Nov 25, 2013 11:40 AM

Page 3, Q19. How would you rate audio streaming, jabber and Meetecho in support of your participation?

22	Did not use.	Nov 25, 2013 11:07 AM
23	I don't know. I didn't use jabber or audio streaming	Nov 25, 2013 11:04 AM
24	Jabber is so 1990...	Nov 25, 2013 10:38 AM
25	Seems to be hard to find jabber scribes at less well attended WG meetings...	Nov 25, 2013 10:17 AM
26	Need a did not use option in the above question set.	Nov 25, 2013 10:14 AM
27	I didn't use these but heard that they worked well.	Nov 25, 2013 9:56 AM
28	Ole Troan transported himself (over IPv6!) to remote co-chair 6man and attend various meetings via an iPad carried about by others. This was fantastic, and what we should aspire to. I understand that it is as much an A/V setup issue as anything else. But at least we have the network in place to do this.	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
29	There were a lot of issues with audio volume, in both directions. I think there should be a WG chairs training on mic-ing presenters. This stuff is really hard to do without someone in the room, and I realize that's probably prohibitive.	Nov 25, 2013 9:31 AM
30	I didn't use meetecho or audio streaming in any of the sessions (and I am curious why I would).	Nov 25, 2013 9:26 AM
31	Don't know how to evaluate -- would need to ask those on the receiving (not sending) side.	Nov 25, 2013 9:10 AM
32	Need Meetecho in more sesssions	Nov 25, 2013 9:09 AM
33	The jabber logs capture only the nicknames of participants, not their actual JIDs. I have run into some cases where JIDs would be very useful.	Nov 25, 2013 8:41 AM
34	You need a n/a option here actually. I just put "good" for things I didn't use. :-(Nov 25, 2013 8:31 AM
35	Did not use them, aside from Jabber, which is fine.	Nov 25, 2013 8:25 AM
36	I discovered too late that I had not requested meetecho support for my WG and that they had no availabilities anymore. I understand that they plan to have support for more parallel sessions for London: this is good.	Nov 25, 2013 8:19 AM
37	None of the meetings I attended had meetecho support	Nov 25, 2013 8:18 AM
38	I didn't use audio nor meetecho support.	Nov 25, 2013 8:07 AM
39	Jabber is the most useful of all since you can read it simultaneously in another session. So if it is not telling you what is going on, it is very poor.	Nov 25, 2013 7:49 AM
40	Audio was great, several remote listeners commented it was surprisingly good. I'm getting tired of dealing with jabber. Nobody wants to install the client much less spend the meeting time dealing with it. Some people with corporate laptops/policies literally won't install it. Chairs don't have time to do so, and run the meeting. So it generally doesn't happen. And those hats - really? Asking people to wear someone else's cheap hat with JABBER SCRIBE all over it, as some sort of special reward? Ick. Sorry, but, ick. If the Jabber traffic can't be	Nov 25, 2013 7:33 AM

Page 3, Q19. How would you rate audio streaming, jabber and Meetecho in support of your participation?

displayed on a screen, and treated as a regular attendance method, then we should do away with it.

41 We really need to move to video streaming all of our meetings Nov 25, 2013 7:09 AM

42 I didn't use these things (again, N/A missing in this question) Nov 25, 2013 7:04 AM

Page 3, Q20. The Plenaries were transcribed and available online in real time. If you used the transcription would you describe it as helpful?

1	I could review what people just said in real time (sometimes I don't catch everything)	Dec 5, 2013 4:33 PM
2	I could understand sentences that I missed. On screen (projected) transcription will be much more appreciate.	Nov 27, 2013 1:42 AM
3	Some speakers had a really strong accent difficult to understand for non english speaking natives. Reading the transcript helped.	Nov 25, 2013 10:01 PM
4	I'm hard of hearing. The real-time transcription is *fantastic* for people like me. It is also fantastic when people with "Accents" are speaking; to translate even from English to English.	Nov 25, 2013 7:37 PM
5	I made it to the technical plenary late and was very pleased to be able to read the live transcript on my phone while on the bus over.	Nov 25, 2013 2:51 PM
6	Did not know it was available since I was present in person.	Nov 25, 2013 1:49 PM
7	specially for fast speaking (such as EKR or Stephen Farrell), useful to confirm what was said.	Nov 25, 2013 10:50 AM
8	I did use this to catch things that I missed.	Nov 25, 2013 9:56 AM
9	I wasn't aware of this facility. How well advertised was it? Maybe it should be highlighted at the opening of each plenary meeting.	Nov 25, 2013 9:53 AM
10	I cannot find the transcript. The link on this page is dead: http://www.ietf.org/live/text.html - it takes you to: http://www.internetsociety.org/live/ietf88/text.html And, there is no link in the current set of proceedings.	Nov 25, 2013 9:38 AM
11	Even if I am a native english speaker, I multitask, I get distracted, I miss a word or two, having the transcription is great. I would ensure that it is easily viewable on screen at all times. I've become very used to this at RIPE events as well. I'd like to think we could have deaf participants as we do blind participants one day.	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
12	What does this cost us? I wonder if the cost is justified.	Nov 25, 2013 9:10 AM
13	Got a feel for how the discussion would be framed.	Nov 25, 2013 9:04 AM
14	Easier to follow discussion if I missed a response to a question.	Nov 25, 2013 8:04 AM
15	Would have been helpfull but I was not aware.	Nov 25, 2013 7:55 AM
16	to reference comments during the session	Nov 25, 2013 7:53 AM
17	As a non-native English speaker, I sometimes miss details that are picked up by the experience typists. The combination of spoken and written is really helpful to get all the details. Please continue!	Nov 25, 2013 7:43 AM

Page 3, Q21. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.

1	A few more or longer breaks, which are so useful for collaboration.	Dec 5, 2013 4:33 PM
2	Don't rely on participants to take minutes or jabber scribe.	Nov 28, 2013 7:22 PM
3	I think we should push back again on Friday mornings.	Nov 27, 2013 12:18 PM
4	Restore late evening sessions	Nov 26, 2013 3:50 AM
5	the blue sheets to confirm attendance at a meeting seem awkward to me. Some people sign, others don't,... and more importantly, can't we find an electronic solution? In others SDOs I've taken part, you confirm your participation in a group session by online registration	Nov 26, 2013 3:16 AM
6	Vancouver is a nice new Minneapolis.	Nov 25, 2013 9:36 PM
7	Agendas posted sooner.	Nov 25, 2013 7:37 PM
8	Lunchtime is too early, and the afternoons are too long. Would prefer lunch 12:30-14:00, rather than 11:30-13:00.	Nov 25, 2013 4:48 PM
9	1. I was unsuccessful in printing a document from my laptop at the terminal room. I wish it was easier to print. I installed the necessary drivers ... on my macbook pro running mt lion but gave up after 30mins. 2. Obviously better breakfast as part of the room-rate	Nov 25, 2013 3:23 PM
10	Get rid of the blue sheets entirely, please.	Nov 25, 2013 2:50 PM
11	Food. Breakfast should have included protein, and on-site lunch would reduce the hassle of going somewhere. Even if it's an optional component, consider having a lunch buffet and a mealcard supplement to the registration fee.	Nov 25, 2013 2:19 PM
12	less time pressure in the working groups :-)	Nov 25, 2013 1:25 PM
13	Recognition of remote attendees! Look how this survey completely fails to recognise that option :-)	Nov 25, 2013 1:11 PM
14	All in all I think that everything went as smooth as possible.	Nov 25, 2013 12:30 PM
15	Don't schedule PIM on Friday next time...	Nov 25, 2013 12:12 PM
16	Open bar at Meet & Greet (Sunday), or even 1 or 2 drink tickets. Better scheduling algorithms (I will volunteer to help design them, if you like)	Nov 25, 2013 11:40 AM
17	It would be helpful for travel arrangements if the meeting agenda was defined much earlier - say 45+ days before the meeting. Currently the agenda is defined very close to the meeting time and this does not allow for people attending for parts of the meeting - hence making flight costs higher.	Nov 25, 2013 11:14 AM
18	Nothing really as they have been well organized and run.	Nov 25, 2013 10:13 AM
19	Loved the videotaping of plenaries for later reference.	Nov 25, 2013 9:56 AM
20	A single plenary (with a break in-between).	Nov 25, 2013 9:38 AM

Page 3, Q21. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.

21	I'd like to see greater transparency in IETF meeting & operations costs.	Nov 25, 2013 9:38 AM
22	I prefer locations that provide a good meeting venue and tourist attractions as well.	Nov 25, 2013 9:33 AM
23	Ole's remote chairing was successful. We should learn from that. Also, more ponies.	Nov 25, 2013 9:31 AM
24	Room seating is really poor and always has been ever since audio conferencing started to be used. The seating arrangement is not suitable for discussion, especially when one is expected to leave his seat and use a centrally-placed microphone in order to speak. There needs to be much more space between rows, and at the edges of the rooms. Ideally seating would not be theater-style, but rather all seats should face the center. PowerPoint needs to die.	Nov 25, 2013 9:24 AM
25	Unfortunately I wasn't at the reception at the very begining: not much food left.	Nov 25, 2013 9:19 AM
26	Missed the social event. Any way we could self fund something, maybe not as fancy, but a decent meal and a place to mingle?	Nov 25, 2013 9:09 AM
27	My biggest problem was that a conflict w/the T10 SCSI storage standards meeting was somehow missed between IETF and T10, requiring me to split my week - I could only be in Vancouver Wed-Fri. For T10, I don't think this will happen again, but the conflicts need to be spotted years in advance, and a few were missed, including this one.	Nov 25, 2013 8:55 AM
28	better availability of terminal room and spots to sit down and work and/or for individual discussions	Nov 25, 2013 8:48 AM
29	More healthy food options, i.e., more vegetables at the breaks.	Nov 25, 2013 8:46 AM
30	Real two-way remote participation	Nov 25, 2013 8:43 AM
31	Early publication of the Friday schedule. Take your time with the rest of it.	Nov 25, 2013 8:31 AM
32	Kindly ask support to the NSA for automated transcripts plus voice/face recognition of people talking at the mike. That would make wonderful minutes.They owe us that one.	Nov 25, 2013 8:19 AM
33	More places to "work" and meet in the hallways at the meeting venue itself.	Nov 25, 2013 8:18 AM
34	It could be useful to organnize some technical workshop during the meeting: on IPv6 implementation for example...	Nov 25, 2013 7:51 AM
35	This is a hard one: I like to sit down in an small group (2-5 ppl) to do editing work together. I find it very efficient. An area to facilitate this would be appreciated, but I don't know how to provide it. Maybe a few groups of medium sized tables - ideally with a computer screen to which the editor can hook up his laptop, so everyone can see the edits in real time. But this is a dream ... ;-)	Nov 25, 2013 7:43 AM
36	Some casual sitting with small tables near the break area are a great help - I saw a lot of people resorting to the bar and restaurants to get these services at break time.	Nov 25, 2013 7:26 AM

Page 3, Q21. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.

37	Hotel cost can be a significant issue in seeking travel funding. In this case it was OK, but please bear in mind for future meetings.	Nov 25, 2013 7:12 AM
38	11:30 is early for a lunch break.	Nov 25, 2013 7:11 AM
39	More room for spontaneous informal meetings. The 34th floor was very good, but not announced well enough. We need more such spaces.	Nov 25, 2013 7:10 AM
40	Always have signage outside meeting rooms to say what is on inside. This does not need to be changed hourly, it could be a daily list.	Nov 25, 2013 7:09 AM
41	Not so often go to the same place! I'm all for exciting places :)	Nov 25, 2013 7:04 AM
42	No major issues, so not specific changes I can think of.	Nov 25, 2013 7:02 AM