IETF 65 Meeting Survey

SurveyMonkey

1. What area are you from?

	Response Percent	Response Count
North America	**53.7%**	**211**
Africa	0.3%	1
Asia	11.2%	44
Europe	32.8%	129
Latin America/Caribbean	0.8%	3
Australia/New Zealand (Oceania)	1.3%	5
	answered question	**393**
	skipped question	**5**

2. Approximately how many IETF meetings have you attended (including IETF 65)?

	Response Percent	Response Count
1	10.2%	39
2	6.3%	24
3	4.7%	18
4	5.8%	22
5	3.7%	14
6 - 10	16.5%	63
>10	**52.8%**	**201**
	answered question	**381**
	skipped question	**17**

3. When were you born?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Before 1950		6.8%	26
1950 - 1960		24.0%	92
1961 - 1970		**33.9%**	**130**
1971 - 1980		33.6%	129
After 1980		1.8%	7
		answered question	**384**
		skipped question	**14**

4. Did you participate in one or more sessions from another location using the Jabber room and/or audio streaming?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		32.7%	127
No		**67.3%**	**261**
		answered question	**388**
		skipped question	**10**

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

	Eliminate	Not useful	Neutral	Useful	Very useful	Rating Average	Rating Count
Audio stream	2.8% (7)	10.4% (26)	**37.6% (94)**	24.0% (60)	25.2% (63)	3.58	250
Jabber room	3.4% (9)	9.4% (25)	**33.6% (89)**	29.8% (79)	23.8% (63)	3.61	265
					answered question		**277**
					skipped question		**121**

6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the usefulness of the audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation?

	Response Count
	117
answered question	**117**
skipped question	**281**

7. Did you attend IETF 65 in Dallas?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	**86.6%**	**317**
No	13.4%	49
answered question		**366**
skipped question		**32**

8. If you did not stay at the HQ Hotel, the Hilton Anatole, why not?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Already full	22.7%	15
Too expensive	**50.0%**	**33**
Exceeded corporate rate	21.2%	14
Location	1.5%	1
Never stay at HQ Hotel	3.0%	2
Loyalty program with another hotel	1.5%	1
Corporate policy	4.5%	3
Other (please specify)	21.2%	14
answered question		**66**
skipped question		**332**

9. How would you rate the following:

	Did Not Use	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Exceeded Expectations	Rating Average	Rating Count
WG Room Power	8.8% (29)	14.8% (49)	**69.2% (229)**	7.3% (24)	2.75	331
WG Room Microphones	9.7% (32)	9.1% (30)	**75.5% (250)**	5.7% (19)	2.77	331
WG Room Sound Quality	4.8% (16)	3.6% (12)	**83.6% (276)**	7.9% (26)	2.95	330
answered question						**332**
skipped question						**66**

10. How would you rate:

	Did not use	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Exceeded Expectations	Rating Average	Rating Count
Terminal Room	**57.6% (190)**	0.9% (3)	36.7% (121)	4.8% (16)	1.89	330
Help Desk	**76.1% (249)**	1.2% (4)	19.3% (63)	3.4% (11)	1.50	327
				answered question		**331**
				skipped question		**67**

11. How do you rate:

	Did not use	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Exceeded expectations	Rating Average	Rating Count
Wireless network	5.7% (19)	11.8% (39)	**53.5% (177)**	29.0% (96)	3.06	331
IPv6	**80.8% (261)**	2.2% (7)	14.9% (48)	2.2% (7)	1.38	323
Host online tools	**63.4% (203)**	2.2% (7)	28.4% (91)	5.9% (19)	1.77	320
				answered question		**332**
				skipped question		**66**

12. Please explain any disatisfaction.

	Response Count
	91
answered question	**91**
skipped question	**307**

13. While the hotel had advantages for the wireless network, it was remote from the city and restaurants. A bus shuttle service was provided to address this shortcoming. Was the shuttle service of benefit to you?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Did not use	**52.5%**	**171**
No	9.8%	32
Okay	8.6%	28
Yes	18.7%	61
Very helpful	10.4%	34
	answered question	**326**
	skipped question	**72**

14. Were you satisfied with:

	Did not use	Unsatisfactory	Adequate	Satisfactory	Very Satisfactory	Rating Average	Rati Cou
Hilton Anatole Guest Rooms	18.7% (61)	1.2% (4)	14.4% (47)	**47.7% (156)**	18.0% (59)	3.45	
Anatole Eating Alternatives	8.6% (28)	24.2% (79)	**36.1% (118)**	26.0% (85)	5.2% (17)	2.95	
Guest Room Internet Access	32.5% (105)	7.7% (25)	10.2% (33)	**33.1% (107)**	16.4% (53)	2.93	
					answered question		
					skipped question		

15. Please explain if disatisfied with any of the foregoing.

	Response Count
	102
answered question	102
skipped question	296

16. How would you evaluate the food and beverages provided?

	Did not eat	Unsatisfactory	Adequate	Satisfactory	Very satisfactory	Rating Average	Rati Cou
Continental Breakfasts	16.9% (55)	19.9% (65)	27.9% (91)	**28.8% (94)**	6.4% (21)	2.88	
Afternoon Breaks	5.8% (19)	17.6% (58)	**40.0% (132)**	30.3% (100)	6.4% (21)	3.14	
					answered question		
					skipped question		

17. What changes would you make to the continental breakfasts or afternoon breaks?

	Response Count
	131
answered question	131
skipped question	267

18. Was your registration experience satisfactory?

	N/A	No	Okay	Yes	Rating Average	Rating Count
Online	6.5% (21)	1.5% (5)	16.3% (53)	**75.7% (246)**	3.61	325
Onsite	29.0% (80)	1.8% (5)	18.8% (52)	**50.4% (139)**	2.91	276
					answered question	**331**
					skipped question	**67**

19. Please explain if disatisfied with your registration experience.

	Response Count
	22
answered question	**22**
skipped question	**376**

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

	Did not attend	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useful	Rating Average	Rating Count
Newcomers	**95.7% (308)**	0.3% (1)	1.6% (5)	2.5% (8)	1.11	322
Editing an RFC	**95.7% (309)**	0.9% (3)	2.2% (7)	1.2% (4)	1.09	323
WG Leadership	**93.2% (302)**	0.3% (1)	2.5% (8)	4.0% (13)	1.17	324
Security	**95.3% (307)**	0.3% (1)	2.8% (9)	1.6% (5)	1.11	322
xml2rfc Intro	**91.3% (294)**	0.9% (3)	3.7% (12)	4.0% (13)	1.20	322
Routing, Bridges and Switching Tutorial	**91.7% (298)**	0.6% (2)	2.8% (9)	4.9% (16)	1.21	325
					answered question	**328**
					skipped question	**70**

21. How do you rate the Plenaries?

	Did not attend	Not useful	OK	Informative	Very informative	Rating Average	Rating Count
Wednesday (Administrative)	**36.9% (121)**	5.8% (19)	32.0% (105)	22.6% (74)	2.7% (9)	2.48	328
Thursday (Technical)	**37.6% (124)**	4.8% (16)	22.1% (73)	28.8% (95)	6.7% (22)	2.62	330
					answered question		**331**
					skipped question		**67**

22. How could the Plenaries be of greater interest to you?

	Response Count
	66
answered question	**66**
skipped question	**332**

23. Will you be attending IETF 66 in Montreal being held July 9 - 14, 2006?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		**68.3%**	**248**
No		10.5%	38
Undecided		21.2%	77
		answered question	**363**
		skipped question	**35**

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

	Response Count
	113
answered question	113
skipped question	285

Page 2, Q6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the usefulness of the audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation?		
1	no	May 5, 2006 3:09 PM
2	Noticed that jaber transcripts were in several cases incomplete, and not always a reliable source of session minutes.	May 5, 2006 11:00 AM
3	On previous occassions I have jabber scribed for others - and at some IETF's I was in this position without a network connection (802.11 was not functional) - an Ethernet cable to the room switch would have been cool in this case. Audio files are stored in a rather difficult wasy to find them - but that said they are a vital resource in getting accurate minutes.... (notes of meetings)	May 5, 2006 8:06 AM
4	none	May 5, 2006 7:03 AM
5	The audio stream is better to be marked with session name, for example CCAMP WG audio stream.	May 4, 2006 10:59 PM
6	- Jabber room is quite useful for non-native English speakers. But without a stable wireless LAN, it is not so useful...	May 4, 2006 8:46 PM
7	No experience	May 4, 2006 3:56 PM
8	nope	May 4, 2006 5:17 AM
9	an independent jabber scribe, that is one who is not also a meeting participant, would help insure that all useful conversations were captured...	May 3, 2006 3:56 PM
10	There was inconsistent use of both in varying working groups.	May 3, 2006 1:38 PM
11	The audio streams are a great resource *after* the meeting is done. If I attended the meeting, I can refresh my memory with what was discussed. If I did not attend the meeting, then I can always get the audio stream and follow what was discussed. DO NOT ELIMINATE THE AUDIO STREAM.	May 3, 2006 10:20 AM
12	I was not aware of the possibility to have audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation. It could be useful if this possibility is advertised in some way.	May 3, 2006 2:19 AM
13	The audio stream for one room (the large one next to the foyer) did not work at all => so completely useless for me, who was counting on it for an important meeting. Other rooms had good audio streams.	May 2, 2006 4:54 PM
14	About jabber room: If there is a realtime narration system for the bof meetings (like TV subscript messages), it should be useful. Right now, it depends on the effort of voluntaly people in the room and sometimes it does not work at all.	May 2, 2006 1:18 PM
15	None	May 2, 2006 10:16 AM
16	Audio streams should be checked at the beginning of every session to see if they are working. Jabber has an initial startup/setup problem that is often hard to work out in advance. A test server and some setup recommendations would be useful.	May 2, 2006 10:09 AM
17	[Only used Jabber] Jabber is totally dependent on Scribe quality.	May 2, 2006 9:09 AM

Page 2, Q6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the usefulness of the audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation?		
18	I would prefer if we could offer audio streaming and remote presentations in a larger amount, especially as most of the meetings are in US, this could make it easier for European and Asian members to participate and even present their ideas during th emeetings - and in the last few years the technologies for remote presentation got pretty mature. I personally would like to use the full remote capabilities (audio, jabber and online presentation) with my next WG meeting. Tobias Gondrom (chair of LTANS)	May 2, 2006 9:09 AM
19	Slides in beforehand. Assigned jabber scribes from each WG.	May 2, 2006 7:17 AM
20	No	May 2, 2006 5:52 AM
21	Jabber room would be very useful. Unfortunately, it is often not possible to follow the topic as not all contributions are entered into jabber	May 2, 2006 4:45 AM
22	Make streaming and archiving of streams more systematic: its been frustrating for me not to be able to follow some sessions (e.g. l3vpn).	May 2, 2006 4:00 AM
23	Better allocation of talking slots -> limit those guys who always have to comment something and arrange better way of handling microphones. You should chech how this is done in ETSI meetings etc.	May 2, 2006 2:47 AM
24	Haven't used them. Generally attended the meetings in person.	May 1, 2006 7:41 PM
25	I think the audio streaming has great use, but there were serious problems with the audio quality at IETF 65. I listened to the SIP and Speermint WGs, and the RAI area meeting. The volume was so low as to be barely audible even through powered speakers at max amplification. I'm not sure I can complain because it was a free service, but it would be really great if this could be better next time for those who can't travel for a whole week.	May 1, 2006 6:03 PM
26	This survey is flawed in that whoever wrote it seems to think that the audio is just for real-time streaming, but it is also valuable because the recording can be fetched later. The jabber rooms are useful even if present in the room. It seems clear that this survey was written by someone who is a little clueless about how the IETF works.	May 1, 2006 4:55 PM
27	With Jabber the quality obviously depends on the minute taker. Selecting multiple guys to take minutes sometimes helps.	May 1, 2006 4:04 PM
28	I was not aware of the jabber rooms, maybe would be better if this was more widely disseminated to folks. Please note that this was my first IETF.	May 1, 2006 3:05 PM
29	N/A	May 1, 2006 2:38 PM
30	Why aren't you using SIP conferencing?	May 1, 2006 2:33 PM
31	Two-way audio would be nice. (Didn't vat have support for a 'moderator' mode? Not that there seems to be any hope of getting ISPs to actually deploy multicast after, what, 20 years?)	May 1, 2006 2:33 PM
32	Presenter should say "next slide" when advancing slides. That helps following the presentation from remote.	May 1, 2006 2:18 PM

Page 2, Q6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the usefulness of the audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation?		
33	I don't use Jabber, but the audio stream has proved very useful in the past. One suggestion is simply to have all of the sessions streamed, and to ensure that the stream works from the very beginning of the meeting - a couple of IETFs ago, I missed the beginning of the ENUM session but caught (clearly) the discussions of the co-chairs after the session ended.	May 1, 2006 2:13 PM
34	Audio Streaming was useful fro colleagues that could not attend but trying to keep track of two meetings simultaneously is tought for people at the meeting.	May 1, 2006 1:56 PM
35	I've been basically unable to find recordings of my sessions, either due to technical problems (no recording), inability to find the right data, or something else, every time I've tried to use them.	May 1, 2006 1:36 PM
36	audio and jabber are both useful for reviewing what happen during the meetings.	May 1, 2006 12:51 PM
37	Bring back video!! If not necessarily streamed live, certainly stream captures after the event! It makes it so much easier to tie faces to voice, names to faces, and opinions to people	May 1, 2006 12:45 PM
38	In WGs where there is expected to be significant jabber participation it would be useful to have a second projector to display chat room traffic.	May 1, 2006 12:34 PM
39	promote it more	May 1, 2006 12:21 PM
40	Volume too low	May 1, 2006 12:13 PM
41	Maybe link them from w/in the HTML agenda?	May 1, 2006 12:00 PM
42	volume is the issue (closeness to mike). somehow ensuring (auto-loudness control) consistent audio volume to match the volume at WG-chair mike will help.	May 1, 2006 12:00 PM
43	the jabber room either wasn't monitored, or was less useful due to time lag between the audio stream and real-time	May 1, 2006 11:54 AM
44	some sessions had good jabber scribes, but more than half of the sessions I checked did not, some sessions had no scribe at all.	Apr 29, 2006 1:29 AM
45	Audio streams should consistently work	Apr 28, 2006 6:20 PM
46	Jabbers rooms are often lacking in sufficient detail to enable participation, but I'm not sure what can be done about it.	Apr 28, 2006 5:35 PM
47	No.	Apr 28, 2006 11:26 AM
48	Feedback from jabber to people in the meeting	Apr 28, 2006 10:45 AM
49	translators	Apr 28, 2006 9:34 AM
50	More wgs should have jabber scribes	Apr 28, 2006 9:29 AM
51	I don't know what Jabber is. I saw several references to it on various IETF pages but no instructions as to how to actually use it. There needs to be a simple instruction link, either in the "Tao of the IETF" or on the main IETF page,	Apr 28, 2006 8:42 AM

Page 2, Q6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the usefulness of the audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation?		
	where newcomers are directed. The audio would have been quite useful except I could not hear it - the audio level was not high enough for most speakers.	
52	Jabber rooms are useful when there is a good scribe, often not the case. Audios is extremely usful, but I had several issues. Mostly a distracting 'helicopter' type whoosing in a few of the salons, but there were several occasions where the audio was stuttered, repeating every second twice. Basically unlistenable.	Apr 28, 2006 8:28 AM
53	Not really. Jabber works as long as the wireless network is working in the meeting rooms.	Apr 28, 2006 7:03 AM
54	consider paid labour to keystroke important sessions	Apr 28, 2006 3:41 AM
55	It would be nice to have the information(URL) to participate in both audio stream and jabber room. You now have the nice supplementation page with all the agendas and presentations. It would be useful to have the links for both Jabber and Audio streams there as well :-)	Apr 27, 2006 9:20 PM
56	no, but I didn't participate remotely. I think they're a very good idea in general.	Apr 27, 2006 10:33 AM
57	Ensure that microphones are working fine. In Dallas one of the rooms presenter microphone was only crackling and not use ful att all. Despite reporting this issue this was not fixed to the next day. I am not certain if it was fixed later in the week, but I don't think so.	Apr 27, 2006 8:39 AM
58	WG chairs should be encouraged to improve meeting minutes thanks to the audio stream.	Apr 27, 2006 6:04 AM
59	An official "scribe" for each room. Many meetings had no jabber presense, presumably for lack of scribe.	Apr 26, 2006 10:22 PM
60	Archive the audio stream for future reference!	Apr 26, 2006 6:06 PM
61	The usefulness of the jabber rooms is uneven as different "scribes" put in more or less detail.	Apr 26, 2006 6:02 PM
62	Allow remote audio participation.	Apr 26, 2006 5:42 PM
63	To explain my answers to 4 and 5: Since I attended locally, I did not listen remotely. But I do use the recorded audio to review later. The last time I did, there was very loud hum, so better monitoring of the audio quality would help.	Apr 26, 2006 5:12 PM
64	Make sure that thee are compentent scribes for all Jabber sessions. Also a policy whereby Jabber particpants who are remote have a voice at the microphone. Ie. the scribes should be able to speak up for those who are remote. while this is theoretically possible, there is not regualrity of practice.	Apr 26, 2006 5:11 PM
65	better mic discipline, presentations uploaded early.	Apr 26, 2006 5:10 PM
66	Better Jabber logging of what is going on and who is speaking... but that might require professionally-trained scribes.	Apr 26, 2006 3:41 PM
67	Setup and joining the rooms as too confusing. We need to have a simple setup	Apr 26, 2006 12:45 PM

Page 2, Q6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the usefulness of the audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation?		
	procedure and common place where the room can be located. Maybe I didn't have the instructions or something, but I did find it not too easy to use. Also, in the rooms there was just a hand full of people and no one saying anything.	
68	The whole point of having a face-2-face meeting is to increase interaction. Having better audio streaming or jabber will not replace this. So I would recommend that you not spend a whole lot of time and effort on this.	Apr 26, 2006 12:16 PM
69	Emphasize getting presentations submitted early so they can be posted on the web for viewing remotely. Also, the Jabber rooms vary widely in usefulness -- depending on how active the Jabber scribe is. More emphasis on needing a scribe and guidelines for the scribe would be nice.	Apr 26, 2006 11:44 AM
70	Did not use Audio stream during meeting but listened to one session later.	Apr 26, 2006 11:42 AM
71	Need more emphasis on getting Jabber scribes. Many rooms were simply sidebar discussions and did not actively note/record the happenings in the meeting. This is crucial when the audio feed fails (which it did at least three times).	Apr 26, 2006 11:19 AM
72	Add a paragraph on the WG Chairs Page on tips for running meetings better, which includes checking for jabber input, announcing slide changes, etc.	Apr 26, 2006 11:09 AM
73	No. When I participate remotely (not the Dallas meeting) they work quite nicely.	Apr 26, 2006 10:54 AM
74	These are wonderful wonderful tools! As WG editor, I was able to use the recordings to double-check a point of consensus. The chairs used them to check the accuracy and completeness of the minutes. I have been able to participate remotely when I couldn't attend, and my Chinese co-workers that were denied visas could participate. wonderful tools! Support varies widely by WG. Chairs need training in how these can be used, and how they should be supported. Some were good about enforcing microphone usage; some were good about having speakers (and jabber scribes) idewntify which slide was being discussed. This needs to be made more consistent. The mp3 filenames need serious work. The files (or at least the links) should identify the room and the time so people can determine which file goes with which agenda session. Naming files by channel and tape series is less than helpful. For example, if I want to listen to the fourth session of five in the day, do I use tape #0, #1, or #2? The people doing the recordings KNOW which channel corresponds to which physical microphone, and which room it is in. They know what time they changed tapes. How about sharing that info? Filenames should **end** in .mp3 so Windows can determine that the file is an mp3 file and choose the approrpiate application. Recordings start before the sessions do, which is good to make sure the whole session is caught, but the tapes start with ten minutes or so of dead space. It would be good if the dead space could be removed from the recording so everybody didn't need to download ten minutes of dead space per recording. Hyperlinks from the agenda to the appropriate portions of the recording would be very nice. Some guidelines should be established for the jabber rooms; there is a lot of background noise during the meetings, which makes it harder for remote participants to be noticed. It might be good to have two jabber rooms per WG - one for official session work and the other for background chatter. (Of course, some background chatter is relevant and it's bad to lose that. Maybe the chairs	Apr 26, 2006 10:07 AM

Page 2, Q6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the usefulness of the audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation?		
	need to ask people to limit the noise they generate so the signal can get through.)	
75	Tried to access the audio stream after the meeting to check details when creating minutes for a BOF. However, the BOF I was interested in was not yet on the server on the Wednesday following the meeting. Would be helpful to get them up sooner, and have them separated and clearly labelled by session, rather than by room and day.	Apr 25, 2006 2:51 PM
76	The only comment I have dates back to IETF 64, when I did participate remotely. The high latency of the streaming audio is slighty disconcerting when Jabber delivers the transcribed comments before they arrive via the audio feed. The quality of the Jabber scribe varies from session to session, but the streaming audio is always excellent. I think Jabber is most useful as a method of receiving questions and comments from remote participants, secondly as a means of following the meeting remotely, and thirdly as a means of supplementing the minute takers notes.	Apr 25, 2006 2:04 PM
77	did not use audio stream. re jabber, the usefulness is directly proportional to have a jabber scribe	Apr 25, 2006 12:18 PM
78	actually with in the very limit time, participator's haven't enough time to concentrate for checking , but it is my opinion that all thing to be virtual class and should require re- check before depart what achieve / not clear.	Apr 25, 2006 2:34 AM
79	Jabber rooms could benefit from more reliable scribes. In several sessions, the audio stream was intolerable, either from background noise, or a problem where every second or so of audio was repeated.	Apr 24, 2006 12:00 PM
80	Hopufully scribers are neede for all sessions.	Apr 23, 2006 10:51 PM
81	Two-way audio of some sort would be nice.	Apr 23, 2006 5:04 PM
82	token control policy support would be useful under certain circumstances.	Apr 23, 2006 4:09 PM
83	Jabber scribes need training, perhaps we need a guide to the first-time jabberer.	Apr 23, 2006 12:04 PM
84	Explicitly uggest that chairs station someone near a mike to relay questions from the jabber room -- the chairs can do it if they're so inclined.	Apr 23, 2006 5:04 AM
85	Many meetings do not get a jabber scribe and the WG chairs should ask the participants "at least twice" and emphatize the importance before going ahead. IMHO, the jabber room is useful for non-english speakers attending the actual meeting also!	Apr 22, 2006 6:44 AM
86	Try to find jabber scribes before the concrete meeting (so improve the chance to get one).	Apr 22, 2006 6:03 AM
87	More wireless mikes so that the chairs, document author and at least the jabber scribe (or the person channelling jabber question) have a mike.	Apr 21, 2006 1:59 PM
88	I think the audio streaming is very useful in theory. However, currently there is no way for the online audience to ask questions - that would be nice. Also, from	Apr 21, 2006 1:14 PM

Page 2, Q6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the usefulness of the audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation?		
	what I understand, the audio was a bit spotty - not very reliable. Jabber scribing definitely isn't good enough by itself for outside participation - it's hard to get jabber scribes, and when you do get a jabber scribe, he or she likely isn't a good enough typist to keep up with the conversation, so you just get a spotty ongoing summary.	
89	If jabber is worth having one or two folks join a meeting, by all means, keep it up. If not, don't. I have not seen that many join for any given session, including the one I chair that had 88 live bodies in the room.	Apr 21, 2006 1:01 PM
90	Mic discipline is always an issue, but it gets better each time. Audio quality is sometimes an issue, but this also has improved over time. The main requirement is that there be a way to alert the people in the room to the problem and there needs to be a way to get it addresses. I was in Dallas and only used the jabber rooms, not the audio, so I don't know how well it worked this time.	Apr 21, 2006 12:39 PM
91	some WG chairs appointed jabber scribes and some failed to appoint jabber scribes. If there are remote atttendees logged on as the session starts, it would be nice if WG chairs required jabber scribing and remote participants to express their views during straw polls or "hums"	Apr 21, 2006 12:25 PM
92	The audio quality of the streams was very poor. For example, listen to http://limestone.uoregon.edu/ftp/pub/videolab/media/ietf65/ietf65tuech6.mp3.2 Lots of background noise and the voices barely come through the audio. I talked with other people who were remote, and they could also barely hear many of the sessions. There was some hardware problem -- impedence mismatch? I don't know. This really needs to be addressed next time around for the audio to be useful at all.	Apr 21, 2006 12:07 PM
93	Use webcams to add a videostream.	Apr 21, 2006 11:35 AM
94	* Make sure that people will say their names at the mike * Have people that are assigned to the Jabber room with experience in communicating between the Jabber room and the physical room. Every time volunteers are seeked and they are not found every time	Apr 21, 2006 10:26 AM
95	Audio needs compression, so noise doesn't overwhelm the softer speakers. Jabber would be much easier if slides were available real-time. (It's hard to frame intelligent questions based only on audio.)	Apr 21, 2006 10:11 AM
96	I was not physically in attendance; I only listened to audio streams, some from the archives -- which were very slow to appear after mid week. The audio for the Thursday technical Plenary was particularly annoying because the IAB members did not bother to use microphones; one could hear the questions from the floor just fine, but not the answers from the stage.	Apr 21, 2006 10:06 AM
97	Formalize jabber scribe, suggest combining jabber scribe and minute taking.	Apr 21, 2006 9:49 AM
98	need to have a better way to see presentation visuals - ideally in sync with the audio. if the output of the video projector could be streamed along with the audio this would be great.	Apr 21, 2006 9:40 AM

Page 2, Q6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the usefulness of the audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation?		
99	The audio streaming was miserable! Even though it is absolutely essential, trying to follow meetings turned into cruel and unusual punishment. This isn't rocket science - get people who can make audio work. Nearly every element had problems - high noise levels and network instability were terrible; room discipline was better.	Apr 21, 2006 9:40 AM
100	Provide jabber.ietf.org IDs, first come first serve. This way, when the rooms work we are all guaranteed to have presence and get in the rooms.	Apr 21, 2006 9:00 AM
101	multiple jabber scribes, so they can complement each other, and even discuss what's happening.	Apr 21, 2006 8:58 AM
102	The audio worked well for me. Sure, sometimes people forget to state their name, although this did not really affect me personally that much as I know the voices of most people on the mike in the WGs I am interested in. Jabber quality varies quite a bit and largely depends on the scribe. Sometimes people scribe for an audience which is in another meeting and not listing to audio, sometimes people scribe more for remote participants who have an audio stream. I do not have concrete proposals how to grow a community of good jabber scribes.	Apr 21, 2006 8:19 AM
103	It seems that the session archiving was not complete. I had expected to be able to replay the audio from the archive to assist with preparing the meeting minutes, but our session was not available in the archive when needed. (If the sessions were added later, then this comment is about timely archive posting, I haven't checked back to see if all sessions are available now.)	Apr 21, 2006 8:18 AM
104	There were sessions that I wanted to attend via Jabber, but the session did not have a jabber scribe. More effort should be made to ensure there are Jabber scribes.	Apr 21, 2006 8:12 AM
105	I have to say that I was really concerned when the change to Jabber was (semi-)announced so close to the IETF meeting, and was announced on the WG chairs list (not WRONG, but most WG chairs are at the meeting), but not on community-wide lists (until I saw Fred Baker's forward to v6ops). The service itself worked well, but there were WGs that spent time figuring out that some were on the old service while others were on the new service, and people didn't know whether the new service would be available between meetings, or what would happen to the old logs). We got lucky - probably not good to make changes of this size so close to meeting times!	Apr 21, 2006 7:53 AM
106	Have WG chairs obtain jabber scribes prior to the WG meeting, so they don't have to ask for volunteers during the meeting.	Apr 21, 2006 7:32 AM
107	I was chairing two meetings where we had jabber comments from people listening to the audio stream. So while I did not use it, I found it useful!	Apr 21, 2006 7:25 AM
108	Ensure that: - people use the microphones - people state their names - disconnect microphones at end of session - chairs and presenters have posted their slides on the web site, so remote participants can view them - ensure speakers state the slide number they are talking to - ensure that at least ONE person in the physical meeting room watches the jabber room for remote comments questions and relays them in the meeting Jabber room is usefull as	Apr 21, 2006 6:25 AM

Page 2, Q6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the usefulness of the audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation?		
	INPUT to the meeting from remote participants, not so much for reporting to remote participants.	
109	The new method of doing simple audio streaming for all sessions rather than multicast audio/video for select sessions is a lot better. The audio is 10 x more important than the video and the video bandwidth-to-usefulness ratio is low. However, it would be nice if it were possible to include the slides in the stream. With MPEG4 audio it's possible to include still images in the audio stream. Worth looking into. Audio levels are often too low. One problem with the audio is that it takes forever to become available afterwards. It would be much more useful if it were possible to listen back immediately after a session. Especially if the chairs or someone else keep track of the time of agenda items and publish this immediately so it's possible to skip to a certain part easily. It would also be very good if people could upload their slides so that they're easy to consult while listening to the audio (or sitting in the back of the room) in some standardized way. With jabber, it's not really clear what the purpose is: a live text feed of what happens in the room, or an out of band channel for comments. Maybe it would be useful to experiment with two distinct jabber rooms per session? A problem with jabber is that you generally see short names which aren't always easy to correlate with a person's real name. Maybe it's possible to keep a list of these? Maybe integrate with on-line blue sheets... For extra credit, record people's mac addresses in case there is network trouble.	Apr 21, 2006 6:21 AM
110	Have the chairs designate a person (similar to designating minute takers, jabber scribes, etc) to read questions from the jabber to the WG audience. In some WG's, volunteers offered to read my comments, but in others there were no feedback.	Apr 21, 2006 5:46 AM
111	Add video (or at least synchronized slides) as well as audio.	Apr 21, 2006 5:32 AM
112	Make it IPv6 enabled	Apr 21, 2006 5:05 AM
113	Jabber "coverage" is too sporadic to count on; usually you can't use it to follow another meeting (e.g., if you have a scheduling conflict and need to be in another room). Not sure if this is important enough problem and easily fixable. However, I suspect that complete remote participation (using audio, looking at the slides online) doesn't need jabber except for raising questions, which should be sufficient. So, I think we need to think about our profile for jabber "remote participation" and/or "concurrent meeting participation"..	Apr 21, 2006 5:05 AM
114	Some rooms of jabber were useful when there are good describer of the session. Some rooms were quite silent even the session was heating. Assiging good describer is one of the key points to make jabber useful.	Apr 21, 2006 5:02 AM
115	This survey is dfficult to answer because it relates to how useful the audio stream was, and not how good the quality was. The quality was "okay" - it was, in general terms, good enough most of the time, and better in 65 than in 64. However, the volume of the signal was often less than the volume of the squeaks and pops, and it often cut out in mid-stream. Considering the vast amount of work in audio streaming, I think it can be done better, especially if sponsors could be found for it who were able to provide some of the facilities. As for the jabber room, the efforts of the jabber scribes are excellent, but I do	Apr 21, 2006 5:00 AM

Page 2, Q6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the usefulness of the audio stream and/or jabber room for remote participation?		
	wonder if it would be worth finding professional transcriptors for the purpose. I doubt it would be worth the cost, but it would be interesting to know that.	
116	Jabber rooms depend heavily on the jabber scribe, in some rooms the effort needed to effectively scribe through jabber is heavily underestimated. Audio streams were from the quality 'barely hearable' to 'absolutely horrendous'. I even had to turn some off because of noise and repeating stream chunks. Although they are i think essential for a decent remote experience. So i think it would be great if their quality could be improved.	Apr 21, 2006 4:43 AM
117	make the recordings available earlier, and split them into the individual sessions would be great.	Apr 21, 2006 4:38 AM

Page 3, Q8. If you did not stay at the HQ Hotel, the Hilton Anatole, why not?		
1	Not attended	May 6, 2006 12:52 AM
2	Just not there	May 2, 2006 4:04 PM
3	unable to attend	May 2, 2006 11:06 AM
4	Did no attend	May 2, 2006 10:30 AM
5	Didn't attend	May 2, 2006 5:53 AM
6	Local Residence of Dallas	May 1, 2006 5:59 PM
7	Live locally in Dallas	May 1, 2006 3:56 PM
8	Local corporate policy is to find cheapest hotel.	May 1, 2006 2:20 PM
9	It was cheaper to stay elsewhere but I did end up staying at teh hotel.	May 1, 2006 2:15 PM
10	Last minute booking, did not get the IETF rate	Apr 26, 2006 1:54 PM
11	I stayed but too expensive, corporate rate much less than ietf rate!	Apr 26, 2006 12:30 PM
12	Live in Dallas	Apr 26, 2006 12:18 PM
13	Didn't have a canoe for Sunday night.	Apr 25, 2006 7:06 AM
14	Wasn't there, generally don't stay in meeting hotel because it's expensive and often full by the time I book anyway	Apr 21, 2006 6:30 AM

Page 3, Q12. Please explain any disatisfaction.		
1	I am basing my ratings on the last several meetings attended, but not IETF65 in particular. In general the terminal room and help desks have exceeded expectations, and the wireless network has been quite good. I have never used the IPv6 or host online tools.	May 5, 2006 4:29 PM
2	I have been in one meeting where there was no microphone for the audience. In other cases, microphones were brought in late. In general the number of microphones and powerstrips was limited.	May 5, 2006 3:17 PM
3	IETF wireless was pretty flaky as usual (I was on the b network)	May 5, 2006 2:21 PM
4	On several occasions the microphones didn't work properly (especially the radio mics) or produced feedback	May 5, 2006 2:11 PM
5	power is most often for the two front rows which is unsufficient for certain sessions with high attendence	May 5, 2006 7:06 AM
6	Wireless kept dropping	May 4, 2006 11:59 AM
7	Too many users, not enough access success rate ;)	May 4, 2006 5:19 AM
8	Wireless network no usable under Windows.	May 3, 2006 1:17 PM
9	Wireless access was limited to only some of the hotel common areas. Wireless access should have been available in every hotel common area.	May 3, 2006 10:30 AM
10	The hotel was in the middle of nowhere. Next time, if possible, book a hotel in the core downtown area.	May 3, 2006 10:22 AM
11	Very low throughput much of the time.	May 2, 2006 1:29 PM
12	many 802.11b stations seemed rebooting periodically.	May 2, 2006 1:22 PM
13	The trouble with ad hoc wireless networks needs to be addressed	May 2, 2006 11:50 AM
14	Lack of power supply in the session rooms	May 2, 2006 11:11 AM
15	did not use items from Questions 9-11 at this conference but have in the past always been satisfied with these items, only room sound quality had room for imrpovement a few times.	May 2, 2006 9:12 AM
16	There weren't enough power cords. There should be one on each seat row.	May 2, 2006 7:20 AM
17	One or two stationary microphones for 50 to 200 people is a joke. Wireless microphones? More than one or two per room?	May 2, 2006 2:54 AM
18	abcdefg hijklmnop qrstuvw xyz	May 2, 2006 2:03 AM
19	wireless coverage was spotty as I have come to expect from 11g, unfortunately.	May 1, 2006 6:06 PM
20	Wireless was flaky the first day	May 1, 2006 5:18 PM
21	I am not sure if I used IPv6 or not. If it was available, my machine would do stateless autoconfig and by Firefox browser would use IPv6 to get to IPv6-	May 1, 2006 5:02 PM

Page 3, Q12. Please explain any disatisfaction.		
	enabled web sites. There aren't many of those, but there are at least a few that I accessed while at IETF which are. I have been more aware about what was going over IPv6 and what was not in the past, but at this last IETF I never had any problems, so I didn't pay any particular attention to that.	
22	I remember that the network was ok but available not already on saturday/sunday.	May 1, 2006 4:08 PM
23	Considerable absence of power strips throughout many of the rooms where WG sessions were held. There was the usual scavenging for a seat with proximity to power.	May 1, 2006 3:56 PM
24	Wireless in some locations dropped within 30 minutes long enough for some applications to fail. The locator usually showed me in a location other than where I was.	May 1, 2006 3:39 PM
25	WLAN connectivity continues to be unreliable. Performance is generally poor inside the meeting rooms.	May 1, 2006 3:32 PM
26	Power in some rooms was really good (lots of power strips). Others did not have power strips, so power was inadequate. Used 802.11b, which worked better than some meetings in the past, but I still had a few throughput and association problems.	May 1, 2006 3:13 PM
27	Please consider automation and don't consider everyone to be a unix weenie.	May 1, 2006 2:36 PM
28	If by the host online tools you mean the sign-up for the Social, having to fish out the registration number was surprising and a pain - I was away from my email at the time. Was that really necessary? Against that, the WLAN worked, which is better than recent IETFs.	May 1, 2006 2:27 PM
29	The bigger rooms did not have adequate power supply.	May 1, 2006 1:55 PM
30	Could have used more room power, and a couple of rooms had only one mic (at least early in the week).	May 1, 2006 1:39 PM
31	to few mikes, need two mikes to start a dialog	May 1, 2006 12:54 PM
32	Lossy. Flaky.	May 1, 2006 12:47 PM
33	the wlan kept feverishly hopping APs and changing DHCP that i could never stabilize my VPNs when I had to. this did not happen with my same hardware (laptop) elsewhere so far.	May 1, 2006 12:12 PM
34	I recall there was some problem with wireless on the first day, but the rest of the week worked well.	Apr 29, 2006 1:32 AM
35	Not enough mics for activ dscussions.	Apr 28, 2006 6:30 PM
36	Wireless network connectivity was evident everywhere I roamed at IETF 65 - however, it was clear that the entire network was not a single broadcast domain, requiring re-addressing upon some network changes. Further confounding this, IPv6 was only available on a subset of the networks. In a few specific areas, IPv6 SSH's to remote systems would suddenly and inexplicably hang because	Apr 28, 2006 11:26 AM

Page 3, Q12. Please explain any disatisfaction.		
	no IPv6 support on the access point I roamed to was available. This was very frustrating while in the middle of editing large documents.	
37	Despite everyone raving about how good the wireless network was, I kept getting dropped, about every minute or so, in some of the rooms. This occurred particularly in Chantilly Ballroom. Yes, I have wireless "B", not "A", so maybe that is the problem.	Apr 28, 2006 8:52 AM
38	you didn't get the aerial density right, too many competing signals swamped cards. balancing channels is hard, but it didn't look like you'd done the measurements on visibility of channels in rooms,and the radio density. G was good, mostly. locking down, preventing hunts helped.	Apr 28, 2006 3:46 AM
39	wireless became unstable if there are many participants in one room.	Apr 27, 2006 10:00 PM
40	Microphones that where not working was not fixed despite bug report on them.	Apr 27, 2006 8:43 AM
41	Especially early in the week th ewireless network was very unstable (probably due to the flooding??).	Apr 27, 2006 8:17 AM
42	occaisional failures of wireless network, probably due to ongoing "ad-hoc mode" configuration issue by ignorant users.	Apr 27, 2006 7:27 AM
43	Several times problems with wireless conectivity and insufficient throughtput speed.	Apr 27, 2006 7:01 AM
44	I believe the wireless network worked well for me because I had an a/b/g card that could move to the "a" network when the b/g network was congested.	Apr 26, 2006 10:25 PM
45	Wireless was a lot better than last time but still somewhat flaky.	Apr 26, 2006 6:53 PM
46	The 802.11b and 802.11a networks used the same ssid. This makes life tough on mac users, as most mac 802.11a drivers only allow you to select by ssid. The help desk was made aware of this, but chose not to take any action on it. I can accept that changing ssid's in mid meeting would be disruptive. I am only commenting in the hopes that they will use distinct ssid names for A and B in future meetings.	Apr 26, 2006 6:10 PM
47	The mic in one room was very intermittent. When I hiked over to the Secretariat desk to report this, I learned that it had been reported multiple times for earlier sessions, but the A/V crew had not fixed it. 802.11b worked most of the time, but some rooms still I could not acquire.	Apr 26, 2006 5:20 PM
48	It was very difficult to find power in the WG meeting rooms.	Apr 26, 2006 5:16 PM
49	The connection was not stable, from time to time disconncted	Apr 26, 2006 4:30 PM
50	Fell off the wireless net a few times ... not sure if the problem is the laptop or the network setup.	Apr 26, 2006 3:57 PM
51	It remained problematic in certain working group rooms (especially those on the 2nd floor, above the "break" area, and the most distant rooms).	Apr 26, 2006 3:02 PM
52	I would find it more usefull if I knew of all the services on a web site, rather then	Apr 26, 2006 12:53 PM

Page 3, Q12. Please explain any disatisfaction.		
	on bits and pieces of paper that you get handed here and there. A common web site will service available and how to use them before the IETF meeting would be more usefull, as people planning on attending know of these thing before hand.	
53	Power availability spotty in some of the rooms, but mostly adequate.	Apr 26, 2006 12:30 PM
54	Wireless network was MUCH better than last meeting, but was still rather slow at times. (I used b/g).	Apr 25, 2006 2:51 PM
55	wireless was good, but glitched enough that I often had to re-log in to remote connections	Apr 25, 2006 12:26 PM
56	Frequent drops on the WLAN, mainly in the 'fringe' rooms. One access point for 120 users doesn't work.	Apr 25, 2006 7:06 AM
57	65 registrations for international participators had not enough time for VISA process and others papers works to drop for VISA, confirm flight etc. after get the VISA i haven’t enough time to get direct flight, I had flight long as much and costing was too high then others I hope. And my professional development and participate in voluntary I did not ask any assistant form any where.	Apr 25, 2006 2:50 AM
58	Tee shirt was not distributed after tuesday ! (...) :-)	Apr 24, 2006 3:44 AM
59	wireless network was fairly stable, but not yet perfect.	Apr 23, 2006 10:55 PM
60	the local information web pages (such as ww.ietf65.org and the noc pages) were poorly integrated with the ietf pages, and useful information was difficult to find if you didn't know it existed. The printed maps provided were very poor and hard to read; it was difficult to find some of the rooms. One useful addition would be a web-based room finder. Henrik has some possible tools for such a service.	Apr 23, 2006 4:25 PM
61	Help desk staff couldn't provide useful guidance re: configuring printers. That info should be on host's website.	Apr 23, 2006 5:08 AM
62	In (at least) one room, the presenter mike did not work properly. The hotel was asked to fix this but the same problem occurred next day(s). Nothing major but the basic tech stuff for our meetings should work and, if there is an issue, people should be more responsive.	Apr 22, 2006 12:58 PM
63	I don't know what 'Host online tools' refer to	Apr 22, 2006 6:42 AM
64	Too few power outlets. I was on battery power often enough that it would drain (despite my plugging in at every opportunity).	Apr 21, 2006 6:37 PM
65	I got random ipv6 addresses... wasn't consistent. Wireless was ok most of the time, but sometimes it cut out... not as bad as other IETFs in the past though!	Apr 21, 2006 4:45 PM
66	Intermittent failures on Wireless network. NOC got fixed by end of week.	Apr 21, 2006 2:22 PM
67	It would be helpful to have DHCPv6 deployed on the IPv6 network. If you're interested in help with an experimental deployment, please feel free to contact me - mellon@nominum.com.	Apr 21, 2006 1:21 PM
68	Best wireless experience in a long time.	Apr 21, 2006 12:47 PM

Page 3, Q12. Please explain any disatisfaction.		
69	Most rooms had plenty of power. The plenary room did not.	Apr 21, 2006 12:45 PM
70	Power was generally OK in small rooms, but very scantily provided in the larger rooms (ballrooms).	Apr 21, 2006 11:57 AM
71	Small rooms only had one mic. Need one for presentation, and one for questions at a minimum.	Apr 21, 2006 11:54 AM
72	Lack of wireless in the second atrium (where the terraces lounge was). In my room (far corner of 2nd atrium) the wireless signal from the next adjacent hotel was stronger than the IETF signal.	Apr 21, 2006 11:43 AM
73	not enough plugs	Apr 21, 2006 11:09 AM
74	I just don't remember how the wireless was at this meeting.	Apr 21, 2006 11:01 AM
75	Power in WGs is getting better, but still isn't adequate in all WGs.	Apr 21, 2006 9:52 AM
76	IETF conferences are too expensive these days. IETF is too unproductive (at least in the areas I'm interested in) to make it worth spending this much money out-of-pocket.	Apr 21, 2006 9:44 AM
77	In at least one of the rooms, the portable microphone for the presenter worked very poorly when it worked at all.	Apr 21, 2006 9:33 AM
78	n/a	Apr 21, 2006 9:14 AM
79	There was not sufficient power in the plenary sessions.	Apr 21, 2006 8:40 AM
80	Thank you guys for providing a wireless network that was reliable enough to support Jabber!	Apr 21, 2006 8:09 AM
81	One of the WG meetings I was in (l2cp) didn't even have an audience mike, and we all had to share the speaker's mike.	Apr 21, 2006 7:37 AM
82	Power cords were relatively few - and none at all in the inner part of the plenary room. WG room microphones frequently malfunctioned, and this impacted the sound quality.	Apr 21, 2006 7:28 AM
83	One of the reasons I didn't go to Dallas was that people said it was hard to get around on foot there. IETF meetings aren't vacations, but being in the meeting hotel 24/7 is the other extreme, and I generally try to find a cheaper hotel within walking distance. Networking in the hotel isn't the most important thing to me, as the meetings start early and go on well into the evening, I can stand to be disconnected between 10 pm and 8 am.	Apr 21, 2006 6:30 AM
84	More microphones would help, passing around the microphones is annoying and leads to less discussions. The sounds quality in one room was quite bad, with statics, and others reported the same on the jabber scribe. I don't recall which room this was now.	Apr 21, 2006 5:50 AM
85	Although I was rather satisfactory about the wireless, some minor remarks: wireless network not available in the room (I stayed in Hilton) and closed too soon on friday. It was also opened quite late just before the meetings started.	Apr 21, 2006 5:47 AM

Page 3, Q12. Please explain any disatisfaction.		
86	Several rooms the speaker (lapel) mics were unusable because they crackled violently when the cable was moved	Apr 21, 2006 5:40 AM
87	IPv6 was not working in some rooms. However, the external connectivity was the best we ever had.	Apr 21, 2006 5:08 AM
88	Was IPv6 provided on Wireless link ?	Apr 21, 2006 5:06 AM
89	Wireless is always a pain for such a large group, but there were definitely some spots where I couldn't stay up, and as it turned out in the DKIM working group the front of the room on the left was just such a spot, and I was the jabber scribe.	Apr 21, 2006 4:55 AM
90	The microphones for the speakers were hard to use, no intuitive way to switch them on/off	Apr 21, 2006 4:48 AM
91	Microphone was missing from the L2CP BoF room	Apr 21, 2006 4:38 AM

Page 3, Q15. Please explain if disatisfied with any of the foregoing.		
1	The food was not very good and quite expensive.	May 5, 2006 3:17 PM
2	I thought it was a great hotel for IETF-- only drawback was the location was remote.	May 5, 2006 2:21 PM
3	Food too expoensive	May 4, 2006 3:46 PM
4	Guest Room access was wired, wireless would have been better.	May 4, 2006 11:59 AM
5	Prefer downtown locations	May 3, 2006 11:28 PM
6	The hotel restaurants were okay, and very expensive for the meal.	May 3, 2006 1:41 PM
7	The food in the hotel was expensive and time-consuming to sit-down, and very low quality for quick pickup. I do not appreciate being held 'hostage' in a remote location regarding food alternatives.	May 3, 2006 1:39 PM
8	Not enough eating alternatives, expensive. Internet access did not work without registration.	May 3, 2006 1:17 PM
9	I was not able to access my corporate VPN using the guest room Internet Access.	May 3, 2006 3:30 AM
10	I found only two reasonable onsite choices for lunch. In one case (the cafeteria) the food quality was poorer than average for a hotel, and quite slow. The mexican restaurant had a buffet (good), but did not seat people quickly (for a buffet!) and ran out of food at lunch.	May 2, 2006 6:36 PM
11	hotel was very remote and food was bad and expensive.	May 2, 2006 5:44 PM
12	Not many options for vegetarians.	May 2, 2006 1:29 PM
13	The hotel was a little too far away from the dining and central areas of Dallas	May 2, 2006 11:50 AM
14	The Sport Bar, the cheaper bar/restaurant in the hotel, was only opened from 4pm to 10pm :(	May 2, 2006 11:11 AM
15	Please attempt to book into hotels that either will provide free WIRELESS access throughout the facility, or, will permit the use of the network without charge. At RIPE52 in Istanbul, RIPE successfully negotiated with the hotel for this feature. Many hotels in the US are moving to a "free-internet" model. It's silly to have to pay $20 a day in a room to have connectivity, or to alternately sprawl all over the hotel lobby just to get a wireless connection.	May 2, 2006 10:32 AM
16	- Rooms only had ethernet - Very few and very expensive restaurants inside the hotel	May 2, 2006 9:34 AM
17	Service at the deli type outlet in the hotel was badly overloaded and slow at lunchtime. The hotel restaurants were pretty expensive in the evening. It wasn't helped by the sports bar being flooded out on saturday.	May 2, 2006 9:18 AM
18	I do not like sites that are isolated or are far from the city.	May 2, 2006 5:00 AM
19	Like IETF in Yokohama, guest room internet access should be inclusive for IETF	May 2, 2006 2:06 AM

Page 3, Q15. Please explain if disatisfied with any of the foregoing.		
	attendee.	
20	I didn't know until the end of the week that the guest room Internet access was free; could have had better information.	May 1, 2006 7:16 PM
21	Would have preferred to have other restaurants within walking distance.	May 1, 2006 5:18 PM
22	Needing to ride a shuttle bus to a restaurant for dinner added an hour to 90 minutes of time to each evening we used it. By the end of the week I was significantly more tired than I would have been had there been plenty of nearby restaurants.	May 1, 2006 5:02 PM
23	lack of inexpensive lunch altenatives	May 1, 2006 4:09 PM
24	The food was expensive and not particularly good.	May 1, 2006 4:08 PM
25	Service at the cafe restaurant was the worst I have seen. The guest room Internet access indicated that it would cost extra, although there was a rumor that the charge would be deleted later. This was insuffiently clear to allow me to take the risk.	May 1, 2006 3:39 PM
26	In room wireless would be preferred, but otherwise, guest room Internet access was good. I had not realized guest room Internet access would be free until I got my bill. It would be nice to publicize that more, or have the hotel reception desk advice you of that.	May 1, 2006 3:13 PM
27	Guest Room - room was in some state of disrepair, carpet was heavily stained, and generally is not what one would expect for a hotel of this level. I was in the tower section. Location was poor for offsite eating and alternative activities. Shuttles help to some extent. On-site dining was expensive, and choices limited. Internet access in the room was sketchy at best, and several times had complete loss of connectivity. Was finally routed to Sprint Customer Care (the DSL provider for the hotel), he needed to reset and reprovision the modem. This took two days to resolve. VPN access through the hotel's network was reset quite often (MS PPTP keep alive would fail).	May 1, 2006 3:11 PM
28	Food was too expensive for quality. Deli restaraunt closed too early in the afternoon	May 1, 2006 2:55 PM
29	Food awful. Food Awful. Food Awful.	May 1, 2006 2:36 PM
30	Typical guest room Internet access - poor. It ASSUMES that one is using a PC. I use a Mac, so as I am not using MS IE 6 on Windoz, the required web page lost state. In short, the web browser proved unusable (putting me through to the Hilton Anatole web site but no further), but as long as that page stayed up I could at least punch a SSH tunnel to back to work and get my email. The mandatory sign-up page still stated that a charge would be assessed to the room each day.	May 1, 2006 2:27 PM
31	Lets stay somewhere so we can walk to restaurants (get out of hotel)in the evenings.	May 1, 2006 1:55 PM
32	There just weren't any places to eat that weren't toxic and overpriced. Fortunately, I live in the area, and was able to ford high water in my 4x4 to ferry	May 1, 2006 1:39 PM

Page 3, Q15. Please explain if disatisfied with any of the foregoing.		
	people out for edible food.	
33	quite expensive	May 1, 2006 12:54 PM
34	Sunday night was an understandable disaster (flooding). But this left me searching for other options.	May 1, 2006 12:16 PM
35	Better choice food alternatives includes (a) vegetarian considerations (b) relatively inexpensive (it was ridiculous in Anatole). Lunch was OK - very decent though still expensive for on-the-go stuff. (thankfully I had wheels and survived evenings). It does not have to be having elaborate/flashy menu.	May 1, 2006 12:12 PM
36	It's important to have near by foo outside the htel.	Apr 28, 2006 6:30 PM
37	Few options	Apr 28, 2006 11:50 AM
38	The hotel was very poorly equipped for the needs of the Vegetarians in our party. The result was that the lot of us could only eat at one restaurant (the mexican taco-bar) during the entire convention.	Apr 28, 2006 11:26 AM
39	Two few eating alternatives at the Anatole. They should have tried to have e.g. the sports bar/pub open for lunch as well.	Apr 28, 2006 9:32 AM
40	Although I was not 'dissatisfied', I think the Anatole is highly overpriced. The guest rooms are the same as any average American hotel. It's a good thing the IETF negotiated for free Internet access from the rooms, because it would be a crime to have to pay an extra $8 a day on top of outrageous room rate. Also, charging for parking is rediculous, especially in that area (being a non-downtown location).	Apr 28, 2006 8:52 AM
41	It would have been much nicer to be able to walk to local restaurants.	Apr 28, 2006 7:07 AM
42	What is the difference between adequate and satisfactory?	Apr 28, 2006 4:52 AM
43	look, I know its hard, but since the hotels ALL now have their own wireless or wired, can't you just hook their backend into IETF and avoid pain? the location having no local choices and then requiring buses, well its a good workaround but it WAS a downside.	Apr 28, 2006 3:46 AM
44	The food wasn't bad at all in the hotel, but I mostly found the food service staff to be _awful_. (I sent this in a note to Hilton too). Service was desultory, careless, and spotty.	Apr 27, 2006 10:36 AM
45	The guest room internet acces was working but annoying as you where logged out every hour. Sometimes you where also not able to log in.	Apr 27, 2006 8:43 AM
46	location was too far from good dining choices. on-site choices were limited, over-priced, and poor.	Apr 27, 2006 7:27 AM
47	Internet access quality not good. Few eating alternative in the Hotel and none in walkable distance from the hotel.	Apr 27, 2006 7:01 AM
48	It was nearly impossible to get lunch at a decent price nearby the Hilton	Apr 27, 2006 6:06 AM

Page 3, Q15. Please explain if disatisfied with any of the foregoing.		
49	The restaurants at Anatole were not bad, but IMHO the venue should have 10+ decent restaurants within walking distance.	Apr 27, 2006 3:34 AM
50	The Internet access in the guest rooms wasn't actually that reliable. The hotel food was hotel food.	Apr 26, 2006 6:53 PM
51	There was no simple food service during most of the day.	Apr 26, 2006 6:10 PM
52	With the exception of the very expensive restaurant in the tower, the food options in the hotel were very overpriced and poor quality. I suspect that the lack of options in walking distance contributed to this.	Apr 26, 2006 6:10 PM
53	When I can get free Internet from a Motel 6 in any small town in California's Central Valley, it was a bit of a pain to shell out $10 for Internet access. So I didn't.	Apr 26, 2006 6:08 PM
54	Anatole lunch was too expensive for service offered.	Apr 26, 2006 5:48 PM
55	Alhough they had several choices, I was tired of the choices, especially for lunch. It should be a priority to have other restaurant choices within walking distance. Dinner was easier as we used cabs, rental cars and the bus to get to restaurants.	Apr 26, 2006 5:28 PM
56	choice of restaurants, time to service during lunch break (high demand), pricing for restaurant and sandwich bar	Apr 26, 2006 5:27 PM
57	Hotel too spread out for convenient access to food. Slow service, limited menu.	Apr 26, 2006 3:45 PM
58	Many of the restaurant choices were apalling. The mexican restaurant was limited to a buffet during lunch, and that had very few healthy choices. The "sandwich table" set up was poorly arranged and staffed, and the middle block was difficult. The two restaurants near the check-in desk were better. I avoided the top floor restaurant after the initial report of its costs.	Apr 26, 2006 3:02 PM
59	Only ate once at Anatole, too expensive and limited (huge wait on Sunday with the flood, as well).	Apr 26, 2006 12:30 PM
60	It was not clear that the IAOC had negotiated free in-room Internet access until mid-week -- this was just a problem getting the message out.	Apr 26, 2006 11:47 AM
61	I rented a car because I knew there was little within walking distance. This was a significant extra expense. I found that after the plenary, there were few eating options in the hotel and was very glad I had a car. Likewise for lunch. I ate in the hotel several times but few options.	Apr 26, 2006 11:47 AM
62	Isolation of the hotel was a serious problem. Lack of IETF documentation about lower-cost alternative hotels was a serious problem.	Apr 26, 2006 11:34 AM
63	It would have been preferable if the hotel had been within walking distance of additional places to eat.	Apr 26, 2006 11:28 AM
64	tiny interior room with a broken TV very few places to eat, all boring	Apr 26, 2006 11:12 AM
65	limited restaurant options	Apr 26, 2006 10:44 AM

Page 3, Q15. Please explain if disatisfied with any of the foregoing.		
66	I found the hotel restaurants and bars satisfactory; they offered good selection at reasonable hotel-pricing, and the shuttle greatly incresaed the options. They did a good job of accommodating the noon rush. I would have liked more bar selection, and their waitresses were not very attentive, but their main bar was out of business due to the flood and I suspect that might have better met my expectations.	Apr 26, 2006 10:26 AM
67	There was a decent selection of eating alternatives inside the hotel. But they were expensive, and after a few days, other choices would have been appreciated.	Apr 25, 2006 2:51 PM
68	i really liked, btw, that there was a shuttle. i was just scarred from wading in on sunday and didn't want to risk leaving the hotel! :)	Apr 25, 2006 12:26 PM
69	Huge queues at ends of sessions for food. What few options for food there were closed before later sessions ended. Not enough choice.	Apr 25, 2006 7:06 AM
70	In-hotel lunch options were about twice as expensive as the food was worth.	Apr 24, 2006 3:18 PM
71	We had few choice for lunch.	Apr 23, 2006 10:55 PM
72	Guest room access was sometimes hit or miss.	Apr 23, 2006 5:08 PM
73	Hilton rooms didn't have WiFi, but rather RJ45 connection. However, the concierge provided a cable. The hotel itself was exceptional (and gigantic - as expected in Texas).	Apr 23, 2006 12:08 PM
74	While it was nice to have lots of areas for side meetings (the sunken area was great), the Anatole was too big and the rooms too scattered. It was occasionally hard to find people and certainly hard to run between two confliciting meetings. The Anatole also had some issues with surly staff.	Apr 23, 2006 5:08 AM
75	Eating lunch was too much of a challenge. Due to the huge queues at the buffet, I ended up eating a sandwich every day.	Apr 23, 2006 1:53 AM
76	Showers in the rooms we unsatisfactory. Wireless network did not work in the rooms. Because Anatole was far away from center, only over-prised hotel restaurants were usable for lunch.	Apr 22, 2006 11:17 AM
77	Limited choice of foods	Apr 22, 2006 9:02 AM
78	To few and to crowded eating alternatives at the hotel, especially for lunch.	Apr 22, 2006 6:49 AM
79	The floor I stayed on smelled as if there'd been a fire there recently (smoke smell) and the air vents in the room smelled moldy.	Apr 22, 2006 6:42 AM
80	$10/day for basic lousy Internet service? You've got to be kidding. I hung out in the lobby and the terminal room instead.	Apr 21, 2006 6:37 PM
81	eating: we're a huge crowd. We need more resturants near-by. room internet access: we had to pay for it, which is unusual from the IETF where we can go downstairs for free...	Apr 21, 2006 4:45 PM
82	Guest room internet was broken when I first arrived. Support only available	Apr 21, 2006 2:22 PM

Page 3, Q15. Please explain if disatisfied with any of the foregoing.		
	during the day. Later fixed, but terribly slow.	
83	The rooms were great, and not overpriced for a business traveler.	Apr 21, 2006 1:21 PM
84	Other restaurants were too far away to use for lunch. Got very tired of hotel breakfast and lunch (and many dinners) by the end of the week.	Apr 21, 2006 1:10 PM
85	Food was very pricey.	Apr 21, 2006 12:47 PM
86	I liked the hotel...it was probably one of the best meeting places I've ever seen for getting work done and collaborating among colleagues. I would probably never recommend that somebody wishing to see Dallas as a tourist stay at the hotel...but it's my favorite IETF venue so far. The common areas and facilities gave people the chance to collaborate outside of the terminal rooms and meetings.	Apr 21, 2006 12:33 PM
87	1. insufficient lunch restaurant choices. It was (a) sandwiches, (b) mexican buffet, or (c) Hotel Food at the restaunt that was in the adjacent area. 2. Lack of espresso. Hire an espresso cart for the week! There are independant people who own these carts and would be very interested in making a lot of money for a week of IETFers! This would cost IETF nothing additional, as attendees would happily pay money for espresso. Did you notice the line to the espresso shop at the Vancouver IETF? It was almost always 30-40 people deep. 3. Espresso cart. Did I mention espresso cart?	Apr 21, 2006 12:11 PM
88	The hotel was in the middle of nowhere. We need to find hotels in urban centers with good public transportation and where you can walk to hotels and restaurants.	Apr 21, 2006 11:13 AM
89	Eating alternatives at the hotel were typical of a 4-* hotel, including charging for the convenience of eating in the hotel.	Apr 21, 2006 10:17 AM
90	No wireless in rooms	Apr 21, 2006 9:52 AM
91	I feel strongly that more eating choices within walking distance are a requirement. For a venue that did not allow walking off-site, the facilities here were good (better than say san diego), but in general I do not think we should have IETF meetings in places where one cannot walk off site to find food.	Apr 21, 2006 8:54 AM
92	I didn't really like the location. While the shuttle was a nice attempt to try and compensate for the bad location, I somehow never managed to take it. I ended up in cabs to get around. Part of the problem is there didn't appear to be any one place in Dallas with lots of restaurants and shopping. We were also worried about being able to get back in a timely manner using the shuttle. In general, it is better if the hotel is within walking distance of eating and shopping. Failing that, it should be on good public transit.	Apr 21, 2006 8:40 AM
93	the usual hi-rank hotel eating facilities, too expensive for the quality they provide. I had to wait for 45 minutes for a steak one evening... unacceptable.	Apr 21, 2006 5:53 AM
94	There were only a very few restaurants in the Hotel and since the Hotel was remote it was hard to go outside.	Apr 21, 2006 5:47 AM

Page 3, Q15. Please explain if disatisfied with any of the foregoing.		
95	Restaurants were too far away. Guest room Internet Access should be wireless rather than wired.	Apr 21, 2006 5:34 AM
96	i find it nearly infinitely preferably to have a choice of eating alternatives in walking distance. the shuttle bus was a nice touch, but not really a substitute.	Apr 21, 2006 5:10 AM
97	Eating alternatives were slow, expensive and very limited.	Apr 21, 2006 5:10 AM
98	As I recall there was a charge for using it	Apr 21, 2006 5:09 AM
99	Can't use Pool and hhonors benefit.	Apr 21, 2006 5:09 AM
100	The only options to eat where the ones of the hotel, since it was far from other restaurants	Apr 21, 2006 5:00 AM
101	There was not enough choice of food near the hotel and there was not enough choice within the hotel. They also didn't have sufficient facilities to seat us quickly for lunch.	Apr 21, 2006 4:55 AM
102	WWW access through some proxy server timed out frequently, making it hard to read web pages	Apr 21, 2006 4:48 AM

Page 3, Q17. What changes would you make to the continental breakfasts or afternoon breaks?		
1	Little food was provided during breaks and breakfasts. In continental breakfasts especially, food choice was (quickly) rather limited and they ended very early (before 8:30 while meetings began at 9).	May 6, 2006 7:06 AM
2	Much though I love brownies and cookies, my waistline would appreciate something less loaded with fat and sugar	May 5, 2006 5:59 PM
3	Again, best on past IETF's -- Would add a bit more hot stuff to the "continental" breakfast, moving it in the direction of a slightly heavier breakfast. -- The breaks have been fine.	May 5, 2006 4:29 PM
4	I liked the variation of food provided during breakfast. However, often the food runs out long before the meetings start. For late risers, few options are left. Afternoon breaks: where were the cookies? I have heard that they were served in some of the breaks but I myslef never saw them.	May 5, 2006 3:17 PM
5	Provide coupons so nobody is denied what they paid for?	May 5, 2006 11:04 AM
6	A few more "solids" during the afternoon would have been nice, considering the cost of the inscription.	May 4, 2006 4:04 PM
7	Better districution of of food to avoid queues Better coffee Less greasy food	May 4, 2006 3:46 PM
8	the food ran out quickly,	May 4, 2006 11:59 AM
9	I avoid breaks due to the poor behavior of attendees (spilling things on me, knocking me, or just blocking the food once they have picked up their own stuff).	May 3, 2006 1:39 PM
10	I want my cookies? ;-) I would like to see breakfast food available at one station until 9:10 or 9:15. I don't think it is necessary for all the selections to be available, but someone should be able to show up a bit late and still grab someting moderately filling and nutritious (a yoghurt or a bagel or a pastry). At this IETF, the staff was wheeling away food at 8:45 and availability of food at that time was hit or miss.	May 2, 2006 6:36 PM
11	The food ran out at 8:30am. They refused to bring out more, saying that the hostess did not authorize any more. A good breakfast is important. This practice of limiting the food in the morning encourages a savage-like practice of rushing in early in the morning and stuffing it down... The food for the afternoon breaks was good and enough quantity.	May 2, 2006 4:58 PM
12	More variety in breakfast choices, and please move cookies back to 3pm!	May 2, 2006 1:29 PM
13	The hotel ran out of food on at least one morning and for an afternoon break. This is not acceptable given the meeting fees.	May 2, 2006 1:23 PM
14	We seemed to run out of breakfast food very quickly in the morning. I know many people were not able to get anything. We need a bit more food in the morning.	May 2, 2006 11:41 AM
15	stuff gets finished too early.	May 2, 2006 10:37 AM
16	For the money you must be paying, they're pointless. Provide coffee, water stations, and be done with it. If people want food, let them buy it themselves.	May 2, 2006 10:32 AM

Page 3, Q17. What changes would you make to the continental breakfasts or afternoon breaks?		
	Many attendees are getting reimbursed anyway. And for those who don't, perhaps IETF can go into the "concession" business. ;) (hey, maybe it will help the budget issues???) Alternatively, increase the fee by $xxx per attendee and get "real" food. There are many people who find a high-dough-content breakfast completely useless and counterproductive. Furthermore, if there can't be enough snacks for "everyone" to have something, then don't bother either. The cookie thing was stupid -- just get rid of the bloody things. Again, what do cookies cost for participants to bring with them or buy in the hotel? Sheesh.	
17	More food. I did not manage to get breakfast or break food for the first two days. Whenever anything ran out, it seemed the staff would pack it up, instead of replenishing it. Only later in the week did that change.	May 2, 2006 10:15 AM
18	Arrangements should be made to bring enough food during breaks. Also, spreading out the food would be better, rather than having it all in one place.	May 2, 2006 9:07 AM
19	Bring back the ice creams!	May 2, 2006 8:09 AM
20	Specific to Dallas: this is the first IETF meeting I've attended where things like orange juice ran out at breakfast and weren't refreshed. If you came late (but still in advertised time) you missed out. General to IETF: some breakfast options a bit lower in fat/sugar (and maybe having some protein) would be an improvement. Of the IETF meetings I've attended only Paris partly met this.	May 2, 2006 6:10 AM
21	fresh fruits for the afternoon breaks. Fruits were not vrey fresh.	May 2, 2006 5:24 AM
22	Well IETF breakfasts are kinda myth already. Sweet stuff from the beginning etc. Well, I'm European so maybe that explains. There was a good attempt with bagels and yogurt.	May 2, 2006 2:54 AM
23	It would be nice if more bread and cheese, not only cakes could be available for breakfast for people from Europe.	May 2, 2006 2:51 AM
24	not only sweat breads but also sandwitch, maybe	May 2, 2006 2:06 AM
25	Nice that they had reasonable seating! That is usually the biggest issue - not enough seating.	May 1, 2006 7:46 PM
26	I am not an early riser, so I arrive perhaps 10 min before 9am to the breakfast area. This IETF I was not able to obtain *any* food at that time during the entire week. This is the first time this happens.	May 1, 2006 6:06 PM
27	better coffee, better food	May 1, 2006 5:26 PM
28	It varied by day. Some days, if you didn't get there in the first 10 minutes, there was nothing left. Other days, there was lots the whole time.	May 1, 2006 5:18 PM
29	More orange juice. (The orange juice is always the most popular.)	May 1, 2006 5:02 PM
30	The IETF food is unhealty and too sweet.	May 1, 2006 4:08 PM
31	Well, usually there is never enough! If you come in at around 8.20 am, you have to scramble to get the remaining food. Having more food will, clearly, make a difference.	May 1, 2006 3:32 PM

Page 3, Q17. What changes would you make to the continental breakfasts or afternoon breaks?		
32	Breakfast was, as in past years, usually insufficient. There rarely was food beyond 8:40 (except Monday morning, which is more lightly attended). This hotel staff was better than in past years about not removing coffee and other consumables before 9am, but some "early removal" did occur.	May 1, 2006 3:13 PM
33	This is a tough question. Typically we are told that snacks raise the Meeting Fees. Since I certainly don't eat $25 worth of food my bias would be provide continental breakfast and have pay as you go for treats at breaks or even charge for both. I use the bottled water but I would be happy to pay a dollar for water too. (Not the $4.00 in the room price). On the treats the portions are often far too large, many cookie and treats are a meal themselves.	May 1, 2006 2:15 PM
34	Hotels are often (as was the case here) underprepared for Day 1. They usually catch up by Day 3, then are surprised to have people evaporate oon Day 4/5	May 1, 2006 1:39 PM
35	Either charge smaller registration fees (or make registration fees dependent on number of days of attendance) or provide better food. It is silly for someone who is only participating for one or two days to pay the same fees for food as someone who is there for the entire week. Rates are way too high for what is provided.	May 1, 2006 1:34 PM
36	More of the popular items. Unless you were there quickly, selection was often limited.	May 1, 2006 1:17 PM
37	breakfast contains mostly sugar, and for a long day, you need more then then sugar. afternoon breaks worked after complait	May 1, 2006 12:54 PM
38	Rather pay more and get somthing that resembles a lunch.	May 1, 2006 12:16 PM
39	breakfast was frugal (the key offerings were gone 30min prior to the end; ie start of sessions). bfast is key since not much time is spent at lunch either and a well-rounded one helps start the day off well for sessions and smothers the impact of poor lunch choices. existing menu items looked OK but their availability, as i mentioned, was very bad (bananas, pastries,...). making emphasis on bananas (overwhelming choice of fruit every ietf) will go a long way in appeasing our hunger for breakfast! so are croissant rolls and danish	May 1, 2006 12:12 PM
40	Would *much* prefer plain and/or fruit-on-bottom yogurt. The pre-mixed yogurt is way too sweet.	Apr 28, 2006 5:38 PM
41	Sometimes a long stretch of sessions before afternoon break.	Apr 28, 2006 5:07 PM
42	By the time I got there, often the food was gone. For the people for whom food is a priority, there is enough food; for the people for whom work is a priority (e.g., staying 15 minutes after the WG meeting to talk about how to progress things), there is not enough food. I've long since taken to carrying around energy bars in my backpack since it's usual that the food is gone, but it's always a bit disappointing.	Apr 28, 2006 10:48 AM
43	They often ran out of breakfast and cookies too quickly.	Apr 28, 2006 9:32 AM
44	Have smaller cookies and more of them. One cookie at that place was enough to give you a coronary.	Apr 28, 2006 8:52 AM

Page 3, Q17. What changes would you make to the continental breakfasts or afternoon breaks?		
45	Breakfast supply ran out before 9am, well before one day.	Apr 28, 2006 4:52 AM
46	more fruit choices. there was a rumour the water is costing you $US2 or more per bottle. If true, this is a collossal RIPOFF. If its how the hotel makes its money back on a cheap deal, they need to find ways to avoid this kind of 'car is cheap, motor costs more' trick.	Apr 28, 2006 3:46 AM
47	I would like more foody alternative, a real sandwidch, more fruit in the afternoon breaks. I would also appreciate if drinks was always available. That was something that the Yokohama meeting ruled at.	Apr 27, 2006 8:43 AM
48	The offer gets more and more worse. If you are not there at least 10 minutes after start, you often got nothing.	Apr 27, 2006 7:01 AM
49	I'd like that salty items were provided. I do not like sweets and that was the only flavor available.	Apr 27, 2006 6:06 AM
50	All-carb (sugar) breakfast/break snacks are the best way to make people unproductive (quick ups and downs in blood sugar level really mess up your head...) Get some real food!	Apr 27, 2006 3:34 AM
51	We have had "fuller" breakfasts in the past. This meeting, the food was sparse and disappeared quickly	Apr 26, 2006 10:25 PM
52	The afternoon breaks really really need to have more food. Enough so that people don't get denied. Also, with the new schedule there needs to be food at both breaks, not just the second one.	Apr 26, 2006 6:53 PM
53	I would arrange for the hotel to keep food stocked until the end of the break. The schedule said continental breakfast from 8-9, but if you arrived later than 8:20 or so, the choices were picked over, and by 8:40 all the food would be gone.	Apr 26, 2006 6:10 PM
54	More fruit & bagels at breakfast. Label items for those with food allergies.	Apr 26, 2006 5:48 PM
55	They were constantly out of food later in the time slot. Breakfast quality was very good, hard to see how to improve. There was always a line for the toasters, but then, I think this is the first time we HAD toasters! Break quality was okay. They consistantly ran out of regular coke early on, although that improved by the end of the week.	Apr 26, 2006 5:28 PM
56	Have it not all be gone by 8:45	Apr 26, 2006 5:20 PM
57	food at just one break - beverage service open	Apr 26, 2006 5:13 PM
58	Continuous availability of coffee and hot water.	Apr 26, 2006 3:45 PM
59	I presume lot of people have already indicated the lack of adequate breakfast on the second day; but I am glad it was taken care of subsequently (I guess there were more people on the second day than the first)!	Apr 26, 2006 1:54 PM
60	If you didn't show up on time, the drinks and cookies during the breaks were usually all gone. Small sandwiches during the break would be great, if they can be afforded.	Apr 26, 2006 12:53 PM

Page 3, Q17. What changes would you make to the continental breakfasts or afternoon breaks?		
61	My concept of food is quite different than the IETF. I used to gain 5 lbs at each IETF. Now I try to avoid the cookies and pastry. I realize I am out of step with most other people. I would prefer fruit, oatmeal for breakfast. I think telling people to only eat one or two cookies would be reasonable. We need water but I don't think it has to be bottled.	Apr 26, 2006 11:47 AM
62	They ran out of food in the critical 8:40-9:00 hour, the hotel needs to bring out food in regular intervals during the break not just at the beginning so the early birds get to gooble everything down. The food when I found it was fine.	Apr 26, 2006 11:45 AM
63	Need protein at the breakfasts. Need low cal, low carb alternatives at the breaks.	Apr 26, 2006 11:28 AM
64	More fruits please. And proper coffee.	Apr 26, 2006 10:44 AM
65	nice job. The food contained enough fresh stuff to be healthy, and ddn't run out as it did in some previous meetings.	Apr 26, 2006 10:26 AM
66	The variety of food choices improved from the previous meeting, but the quantity was low, and often a particular selection was located on just one or two tables. It would be nice to have, say 5 different stations, each with the same (large) selection -- would make it easier for people rushing to a session to get in and out quickly.	Apr 25, 2006 2:51 PM
67	4 1/2 hours is too long between lunch and the afternoon break with food. There needs to be food at the first afternoon break.	Apr 25, 2006 2:26 PM
68	frankly, more food. i missed food at breakfast even tho arriving in time. afternoon was better but still a bit skimpy. would also have preferred food at first afternoon break	Apr 25, 2006 12:26 PM
69	Less American stodge/crap please. Fruit is welcome, but more healthy alternatives welcomed.	Apr 25, 2006 7:06 AM
70	Actually it is not my area for suggestion because there have professional over there who might provide some suggestions and assistant.	Apr 25, 2006 2:50 AM
71	Order enough food so that we don't run out.	Apr 24, 2006 4:25 PM
72	Nothing much to eat at afternoon breaks if previous session ends late ;)	Apr 24, 2006 3:57 AM
73	The amount of breakfasts and afternoon breaks were not enough.	Apr 23, 2006 10:55 PM
74	Spread out the food, both in terms of time and location.	Apr 23, 2006 5:08 PM
75	ice cream on some days :-)	Apr 23, 2006 4:25 PM
76	Healthier and more options. Bagels were stale and uninteresting. Pastries, cookies, cakes/brownies are not very health-conscious. Nice as an option, but should also have variety for those not wishing to overload on sugar.	Apr 23, 2006 2:38 PM
77	What ever happened to ice cream in the afternoon (or is that for summer events only) ?	Apr 23, 2006 12:08 PM
78	More healthy breakfast alternatives: yogurt, granola, fruit.	Apr 23, 2006 5:08 AM

Page 3, Q17. What changes would you make to the continental breakfasts or afternoon breaks?		
79	Make non-sugary stuff available at breaks -- e.g. fresh fruit, or savoury snacks.	Apr 23, 2006 1:53 AM
80	At some point, it would be really nice if the breakfast would feature a bit more non-sweet-and-sticky selection. Fruit and juices (and, of course, coffee) are great; the rest leaves some room for improvement (note that pricing issues are well understood but there may be some room)	Apr 22, 2006 12:58 PM
81	Not good food. Not enough diversity fior breakfast	Apr 22, 2006 9:02 AM
82	More healthy food for breakfast would be nice.	Apr 22, 2006 6:49 AM
83	I was quite disappointed - after the improvements experienced in Vancouver, where there was more fruit and not all bread and cookies were based exclusively on white flour and sugar, this was back at the bad old state of things: White flour and sugar cookies, cookies, cookes. Not much fruit - and most of what was available was melons of various kinds, which is too much water and too little nourishment to be an alternative source of energy when you can't or won't eat the sugar and white flour cookies. Not good.	Apr 22, 2006 6:42 AM
84	Too little food for breakfast. I cannot eat anything sweet in the morning, so other offering, such as sandwiches, please..	Apr 22, 2006 2:52 AM
85	They're barely adequate and there were never enough cookies. I understand that making them better would cost real money while not making us produce better Internet standards, so perhaps no change. I'd explore making them simpler and tastier. Fancy chips in bags (I don't mean Lay's---I mean multicolored vegetable chips and such) are probably a lot cheaper than the catered junk the hotels try to foist on you. Bonus: you could send a secretary with a van to the nearest Trader Joe's and not deal with the hotel's catering staff.	Apr 21, 2006 6:37 PM
86	The breakfast food ran out frequently, which isn't good if you got there late. I don't care as much about snacks since they're not required for survival. I always wish for more protein based breakfasts, but I doubt i'll ever get them :-/ Too many carbs.	Apr 21, 2006 4:45 PM
87	A bit light and the food disappeared quickly.	Apr 21, 2006 2:22 PM
88	Not enough food at breakfast for late comers. Breakfast food quality was poor.	Apr 21, 2006 2:01 PM
89	Quantity/availability of food seemed to be very hit-or-miss... many breaks ran out of food too early.	Apr 21, 2006 1:34 PM
90	The cookies were never out when expected, and, frankly, it would be nice if there were something other than cookies, although I understand that they probably keep better than, e.g., foccaccia squares or something like that. I would suggest also that you appeal to IETFers' sense of fairness by putting out a sign that says "please take one cookie, eat it, and then if there are any left, take another." Most IETFers seem insensitive to the plight of other IETFers who come out of working groups late, and simply grab as many cookies as they imagine they might want. But as I say, I think most IETFers have a sense of fairness and a respect for protocol, so if you make a suggestion like this, it will probably be honored, and that might be nice for the people who don't come out earliest. It's really a very small problem, but the solution is cheap.	Apr 21, 2006 1:21 PM

Page 3, Q17. What changes would you make to the continental breakfasts or afternoon breaks?		
91	need more diet coke (a source of caffiene for some of us that don't drink coffee) in the mornings. Afternoons didn't have enough cookies.	Apr 21, 2006 1:08 PM
92	I know the business with ekr at the plenary was a bit of a joke, but there's a serious issue here. Sufficient food at afternoon breaks is essential unless we want everyone who is hungry to have to run off and find something somewhere else. This will have an impact on sessions starting on time and probably on attendance. Like it or not, people need to eat and sufficient food needs to be provided. And no, the suggestion that we have cookie monitors is nothing short of idiotic. I was there every afternoon and watched and IMO the overstocking problem is being overstated.	Apr 21, 2006 12:47 PM
93	none.	Apr 21, 2006 12:33 PM
94	Add dry cereal to breakfast. Make sure that afternoon breaks have fruit in addition to cookies/cakes.	Apr 21, 2006 11:57 AM
95	Except for the days early in the week where things ran out, it was fine.	Apr 21, 2006 11:54 AM
96	When I inquired why there was no breakfast (as usual, it was all gone in the first minute), I was told by one of the penguin-suits that enough food for 900 people had been requested and provided - even though there was obviously far in excess of that number of people. They were only too willing to provide additional food, if only someone would ask.	Apr 21, 2006 11:43 AM
97	Too heavy on the sugar food group and not enough of the salt food group.	Apr 21, 2006 11:16 AM
98	lighter food, the cookies are always bad and too heavy	Apr 21, 2006 11:09 AM
99	Leave coffee out all day (my memory is hazy about whether this was done or not).	Apr 21, 2006 10:17 AM
100	They were a bit aggresive about removing the food before the end of the breaks.	Apr 21, 2006 9:52 AM
101	I didn't go to Dallas but I find that I can rarely eat the food provided at IETF conferences. I need protein for breakfast but the food provided is usually starchy and sugary. Also the pastries, cookies, etc. at both breakfasts and afternoon breaks are usually made with trans fats and should not be eaten by anyone. I resent paying money for food that isn't edible.	Apr 21, 2006 9:44 AM
102	Add full fat yougurts :-). Also some sweets rather than cookies (during breaks) would be nice.	Apr 21, 2006 9:32 AM
103	I like the increasing availability of healthy alternatives and would like to see more. I would like to see liquids available for longer periods. I prefer coffee but obviously there are tea, soda, and water drinkers. Extending the breakfast to include an extra 30-60 minutes of liquids and then putting an extra 15-30 minutes of liquids in front and after the morning and afternoon breaks. Since we seem to have moved to the two afternoon break model it would be great to have liquids at the first one and then both liquids and snack at the second. Personally, I don't like the late dinner but with a late snack I'll keep up with the majority.	Apr 21, 2006 9:14 AM

Page 3, Q17. What changes would you make to the continental breakfasts or afternoon breaks?		
104	more protein (but not all animal protein), and less sugar	Apr 21, 2006 9:03 AM
105	ensure that they have more than 1 banana for the entire set of IETFers who attend (I mostly couldn't find any, though they had then occasionally).	Apr 21, 2006 8:54 AM
106	It would be good if we could ensure the fruit provided for the breaks was ripe.	Apr 21, 2006 8:40 AM
107	I spoke with several people who show-up at 8:45 and expect that a reasonable selection of breakfast items will still be available (they're usually complaining that nothing is left). This can only be addressed by pacing the food delivery throughout the breakfast hour, with a complete breakfast cart being rolled-out at 8:45. Usually the drinks are sufficient, it's the food that runs out.	Apr 21, 2006 8:27 AM
108	You guys fixed the quantity issue quickly - thanks!	Apr 21, 2006 8:09 AM
109	Multiple Choices, more healthy food	Apr 21, 2006 7:53 AM
110	More variety of snacks during the week in the afternoon breaks.	Apr 21, 2006 7:37 AM
111	BREAD at the breakfast! (not just the round strange doughy things)	Apr 21, 2006 7:28 AM
112	More food at afternoon breaks	Apr 21, 2006 7:14 AM
113	I didn't use IETF Breakfast IETF supplied food is always too high in calories and sugar.	Apr 21, 2006 7:14 AM
114	When you didn't rush to the break immediately after the meeting, the cookies were gone. (Eric got them all.)	Apr 21, 2006 7:02 AM
115	Bread for breakfast would be nice. not only muffins or cake like pastry. With some cheese, sliced meat or other stuff besides fruit. Not that I don't like fruit.	Apr 21, 2006 6:10 AM
116	Diversify the provided food. Increase the provided food. Increase the provided drinks. For such an expensive hotel, it had very poor quantities and diversity.	Apr 21, 2006 6:02 AM
117	less chocholate cakes... a bit more variety on fruits (use seasonal frut, not standard tasteless melons and strawberries), and better cookies.	Apr 21, 2006 5:53 AM
118	The food was really bad. In the monings when I arrived, there was no food anymore, and in the afternoon the food was bad as well.	Apr 21, 2006 5:47 AM
119	very bad	Apr 21, 2006 5:43 AM
120	Don't let the staff take anything away (personal or service table) until it is finished	Apr 21, 2006 5:40 AM
121	More food!	Apr 21, 2006 5:34 AM
122	More selection, including more non-sweet offerings	Apr 21, 2006 5:15 AM
123	More fruits.	Apr 21, 2006 5:15 AM
124	Afternoon break too little food. What happened to icecream thursdays? Breakfast uninspired - so after first day went to startbucks	Apr 21, 2006 5:09 AM

Page 3, Q17. What changes would you make to the continental breakfasts or afternoon breaks?		
125	Refreshments quickly ran out at afternoon breaks..	Apr 21, 2006 5:09 AM
126	I agree with suggestions that food/drink should be `rate-limited' to avoid exhaustion. Food tokens could be distributed with registration packages, and additional tokens could be purchased.	Apr 21, 2006 5:00 AM
127	The morning breakfast was gone before 8:45 and that was a real problem. Also, we need healthier alternatives. I don't know about you guys but I'm getting older and I am not the human garbage can I was when I started coming to these things.	Apr 21, 2006 4:55 AM
128	More alternatives to cookies - fresh fruit/yoghurt	Apr 21, 2006 4:54 AM
129	first days, breakfasts were out of any food after 8h45	Apr 21, 2006 4:52 AM
130	Limited choice during breakfast, especially when you didn't show up right from the beginning. The offer for healthy stuff (fruit, yoghurt,...) did not last very long during afternoon breaks.	Apr 21, 2006 4:50 AM
131	Food for breakfast was not enough.	Apr 21, 2006 4:48 AM

Page 3, Q19. Please explain if disatisfied with your registration experience.		
1	Voucher for social event was missing.	May 3, 2006 1:17 PM
2	The Online receipt does not state the type of card that was used. I had real trouble getting reimbursed based on online receipt.	May 2, 2006 5:44 PM
3	For the second event running I got multiple confirmations of registration/credit card payments. For IETF 64 this only resulted in one credit card payment but for IETF 65 my credit card was billed twice for the same registration and I had to get this fixed - this happened without hassle but it was a nuisance for both myself and the secretariat. I have no idea why it happened - I don't *think* I hit the button twice!!	May 2, 2006 9:18 AM
4	Online Registration did not work as our registration mail was targeted as spam and went to the IETF spam folder. However, the registration team reacted very professional and entitled me to be eligible for the early bird fee although registering onsite.	May 1, 2006 4:28 PM
5	Big line to register on the monday morning without much organisation.	May 1, 2006 3:56 PM
6	This year there were not separate lines for pre-paid vs. not (that I could tell), and the lines seemed a bit slower.	May 1, 2006 3:13 PM
7	You had the social ticket and onsite registration booth as one booth. It would have been more convenient if they were separated.	Apr 27, 2006 9:23 PM
8	lines were too long	Apr 27, 2006 7:27 AM
9	not having a separate table for social registration meant i had to stand in line the first day with the same folks who had not paid, which made that longer than it needed to have been for just the social. no biggie, just fyi. btw, I think "dissatisfied" has 2 s's (well 3 total :)	Apr 25, 2006 12:26 PM
10	Long slow lines, and no signs to tell people where to line up.	Apr 24, 2006 4:25 PM
11	The payment scheme for online registration does not mesh well with our corporate payment scheme -- I do not have an account instead I register, then go with a payment slip to our people; they end up doing the paying. This might be more the fault of my company than of the IETF.	Apr 23, 2006 1:53 AM
12	The only name card badge option was a much too big thing to hang around the neck, which said 'Nokia'. Normally you have the option of something a little less intrusive to hang around the neck, or a safety-pin based holder (of which I always choose the latter).	Apr 22, 2006 6:42 AM
13	The agenda was available a bit late. I suggest to publish a rough agenda ASAP (with the meeting venue & accommodation for instance, it will make some admins happier)	Apr 22, 2006 6:08 AM
14	I never received an email confirmation of the payment made by fax. Please make sure you send it next time...	Apr 22, 2006 2:52 AM
15	The online receipt said the charge would appear as one thing on your credit card but came out as another. Additionally, the online receipt didn't list the amount paid anywhere. These sorts of things interact badly with increasingly anal-	Apr 21, 2006 12:47 PM

Page 3, Q19. Please explain if disatisfied with your registration experience.		
	retentive corporate travel expense bean counters. This may sound as trivial as the cookies but it is very serious - fighting for reimbursements has a serious chilling effect on my willingness to attend future meetings.	
16	I find the payment mechanism annoying. I would like to register and provide payment info well in advance. But having my credit card billed in advance complicates expensing. I want the credit card bill to be close to the meeting time. I know I could register in advance and then pay just before the discount deadline, but I find it easier to just wait till the deadline to do both. It would be good if you would (at least optionally) file the charge to credit cards at the early registration deadline.	Apr 21, 2006 11:01 AM
17	Queues for picking up registrations packs were not labelled, which was a bit annoying.	Apr 21, 2006 9:32 AM
18	The prepaid registration lines on Monday morning were much too long.	Apr 21, 2006 8:21 AM
19	Big monday morning line, understandable though given the flooding.	Apr 21, 2006 6:39 AM
20	Was sent away from desk for ariving 5mins early then a long and chaotic set of lines formed with no one really knowing which line they were supposed to be in	Apr 21, 2006 5:09 AM
21	Need *legal* invoices, unless you want to pay for our costs !	Apr 21, 2006 5:08 AM
22	For some reason (consistently over many IETFs), the on-line registration only likes initial capital letters in names, changing my surname from McDonald to Mcdonald.	Apr 21, 2006 5:06 AM

Page 3, Q22. How could the Plenaries be of greater interest to you?		
1	Shorter (easier to find time in the agenda) and more focused on specific subjects.	May 6, 2006 7:06 AM
2	-- The plenaries in the past several IETF's have generally been good, and I would rate them quite informative, and useful.	May 5, 2006 4:29 PM
3	No idea. I don't care much for plenaries.	May 5, 2006 3:17 PM
4	Shorter, more to the point. Too much time is currently wasted in them with platitudes.	May 3, 2006 1:39 PM
5	shorter!!	May 2, 2006 5:44 PM
6	I really wanted to attend the technical plenary. I like the coverage of emerging IETF work in the technical plenary.	May 2, 2006 11:41 AM
7	I have one bit of HONEST feedback. Please inform your speakers that the point of the plenary is to COMMUNICATE TO THE LISTENERS, not to prove how smart they are by how fast they can talk. I am a native english speaker AND a very good listener, and I could not follow half of what was said by some speakers, and NONE of anything Eric Rescola said. I have intense respect for him, but his arrogant response from the microphone after someone asked him to slow down was ridiculous. Please inform speakers that to MANY people in the room, English is a SECOND language. I can't imagine that many of the ESL attendees was able to garner any important information from many of the presentations. The point of the PLENARY is to COMMUNICATE. As the organizers, it is IETF's job to "NOTE WELL" to presenters that they need to keep that in mind.	May 2, 2006 10:32 AM
8	Have fewer administrative presentations and more topics that are intended to create discussion and get community opinion. One way communication is better done via web or e-mail.	May 2, 2006 9:07 AM
9	I'm not interested in the administrative./ if necessary, they should be briefer	May 2, 2006 5:00 AM
10	I was unable to stay for the technical plenary; good technical talks would be great.	May 1, 2006 7:46 PM
11	I acknowledge the fact that it is extremely difficult to make them more interesting. I would obviously like to have more technical discussions/presentations.	May 1, 2006 4:08 PM
12	I was not aware of the classes listed in number 20 being offered. I would be very interested in attending such classes in the future. I hope they will be offered again ! Or if the material is made available in slides online (similar to meeting minutes) that would be great.	May 1, 2006 3:39 PM
13	Most of the content should be on web pages rather than hoarded for presentation at the meeting.	May 1, 2006 3:39 PM
14	Bring back Bill Simpson	May 1, 2006 3:13 PM
15	Shorter. Earlier. Not after 8 hours of meetings. Plenaries should be first thing in the morning so people are bright and fresh and not tired and stale.	May 1, 2006 2:36 PM

Page 3, Q22. How could the Plenaries be of greater interest to you?		
16	Meaty technical topics are good.	May 1, 2006 1:17 PM
17	Administrative stuf can be kept online and no point in discussing them. Provide more technical discussion. Invite people to talk more about the internet problems that we have..	May 1, 2006 12:40 PM
18	I'm sick of people standing up at the mic in the Technical plenaries and spouting religious propaganda. The end-to-end allatoyahs and the fundamentalist anti-NAT pastors seem to dominate the mic at every IETF. Is there any way that the IAB can foster a *reasoned* technical discussion about some topic of interest without these IP religious fundamentalists taking possession of the conversation? How about cutting them off when they start to spout their doctrine?	May 1, 2006 12:36 PM
19	Have real discussion at the Wednesday pleny	Apr 28, 2006 6:30 PM
20	If the plenaries contained something other than communual verbal-masturbatory drek, you would think they might start carrying a small amount of signal. The charts and graphs we see at every IETF could be published on the mailing lists after (and are easier to digest in a web browser anyway). More time could actually be spent talking about work going on at that IETF instead.	Apr 28, 2006 11:26 AM
21	find a way to make the meeting attractive in talking of every datacoms issues and not only of the core issues of the Internet datacoms application. Make it international, multilateral, multilingual and multinational in concerns.	Apr 28, 2006 9:37 AM
22	Less whining. Clearer "technical" talks.	Apr 28, 2006 4:52 AM
23	more invited speakers like schier. less 'why are we here' navel gazing. summaries of WG states from ADs. please, the whole idea of the group hug is killing me, it drives me CRAZY. it must be an american thing. can we stop it?	Apr 28, 2006 3:46 AM
24	work on real technical problems even if controversial (i.e. multihoming)	Apr 27, 2006 7:27 AM
25	Especially the DHT presentation was very good.	Apr 27, 2006 7:01 AM
26	pack the two plenaries into one.	Apr 27, 2006 6:06 AM
27	The presentation portion of the Admin plenary is basically a waste of time and should be cancelled. During the Open Mike portion of the Admin plenary, I got the impression the chair was trying to cut off discussion as soon as possible. The point of this plenary is to get feedback from the community and so we need to give people time to talk. Perhaps removing the presentations would help here.	Apr 26, 2006 6:53 PM
28	More technical info.	Apr 26, 2006 6:08 PM
29	Skip pure statistics presentations and send those by email. Consider having a panel discussion on a controversial topic.	Apr 26, 2006 5:48 PM
30	Dunno; there was just not anything of "High Entertainment Value" this time. It was boring. I did appreciate the IRTF presentation, as always.	Apr 26, 2006 5:28 PM
31	More genuine opness and tranparency on the part of the IAB and IESG	Apr 26, 2006 5:16 PM

Page 3, Q22. How could the Plenaries be of greater interest to you?		
32	Structured topics for open mike - announced to the ietf list ahead of time.	Apr 26, 2006 5:13 PM
33	Combine them. They take too much time.	Apr 26, 2006 3:02 PM
34	Much of the administrative material could be condensed and provided on line. We are getting too much detail. It looks like administratively, things are improving. Keep it up. I think the major cost of attendance is overlooked, our time cost. Each attendee is probably worth $2k/week to employer. More than the cost of cookies.	Apr 26, 2006 11:47 AM
35	You didn't offer a comments section for the EDU stuff. I didn't get to attend many of the EDU sessions, but I read all the slides and learned from them. Thanks, edu team! Admin plenaries tend to be self-focused. They have been getting better, but I would like to see more orientation towards "you are our customers. Here's what we are doing to improve our products/services for you." Soem of the EDU team tutorials are about how to better utilize the services available to you, or how to better work with the admin teams. It might be nice to have the rfc-editor team discuss new tools that make their jobs easier, such as how xml2rfc can make it easier to get drafts processed quickly, and how the shepherding process can make things progress more smoothly, and so on.	Apr 26, 2006 10:26 AM
36	Didn't get a lot out of the plenaries. Perhaps make the routine reports available on a website rather than presenting each of them?	Apr 25, 2006 2:51 PM
37	plenaries session will be the great helps for any body, i think it will mandatory to achieved the terms and others technical matters from that. i always desire for that .	Apr 25, 2006 2:50 AM
38	I don't see how anybody manages to stay awake during the plenaries.	Apr 24, 2006 4:25 PM
39	The speaker on distributed hash tables was almost indecipherable. Talks way too fast, too many side comments to himself, assumed too much knowledge of the topic. The idea of a technical presentation is good, though -- but relevance to a majority of the audience might be difficult.	Apr 23, 2006 2:38 PM
40	some selected, interesting, technical topics...	Apr 22, 2006 2:52 AM
41	I liked Eric's presentation on distributed hash technologies.	Apr 21, 2006 2:22 PM
42	Continue technical presentations at the Thursday plenaries. On Wednesday plenaries, the reports are becoming tedious. Perhaps they could be posted on the web site, and a brief summary at the meeting should be sufficient.	Apr 21, 2006 1:49 PM
43	They're theoretically interesting, but I'm usually too burnt to be willing to sit through them, because they are rather long and frequently rather dry, and also I feel helpless to do anything about the problems raised there. When I have attended plenaries, though, it's generally been a good experience.	Apr 21, 2006 1:21 PM
44	Allow us to ask questions of each presenter at the end of their presentation, instead of all at once at the end of all of the presenters. Often times, questions need to be "in the moment" to retain context with IETFers. I didn't ask my 2 questions of the IANA presenter because they would have sounded out of context if asked when I was given a chance to (when the presenter was not on	Apr 21, 2006 1:08 PM

Page 3, Q22. How could the Plenaries be of greater interest to you?		
	stage anymore).	
45	Ekr session on distributed hash tables was good. More stuff like that, please.	Apr 21, 2006 12:47 PM
46	i thought the distributed hash table presentation provided useful technical information to anybody from various technical backgrounds.	Apr 21, 2006 12:33 PM
47	Better marketing to encourage attendance?	Apr 21, 2006 11:43 AM
48	more technical	Apr 21, 2006 11:09 AM
49	They are sometimes interesting, and I usually go. But this time I was sick, so I didn't go.	Apr 21, 2006 11:01 AM
50	This question needs to be asked sooner. I don't even clearly remember _whether_ I listened to them both.	Apr 21, 2006 10:14 AM
51	If the IAB speakers were to use microphones.	Apr 21, 2006 10:08 AM
52	They cannot. I view the plenary as a chance - offered by the IETF leadership - to get gripes out in public. In other words, they are an opportunity for people to vent. I do not want to attend meetings that serve that purpose.	Apr 21, 2006 9:33 AM
53	I liked IAB technical presentation by Eric Rescorla. We should have more presentations like this one. Administrative plenaries seem a bit boring.	Apr 21, 2006 9:32 AM
54	Nothing specific. There are some things that need to be discussed and they are not always interesting. But I see the effort to add more interesting discussions or presentations and I would encourage more of that. You might also consider area reports. We talk alot about the need for cross fertilization. Presenting a technical overview of one or two areas each meeting could be helpful.	Apr 21, 2006 9:14 AM
55	I miss the great debates. Now answers are so carefully crafted it might as well be the UN.	Apr 21, 2006 9:03 AM
56	I missed the "community meeting" aspect from Paris and from Vancouver, especially since there were so many Gen-Area issues in the meeting that affected the entire community.	Apr 21, 2006 8:09 AM
57	By suggesting some NEW interesting topic(s) to present and have time to debate them... Also having people from the academy to talk about some very new projects may be interesting...	Apr 21, 2006 7:53 AM
58	I've been to too many plenaries :-(	Apr 21, 2006 7:37 AM
59	Less quibling over details by audience	Apr 21, 2006 7:14 AM
60	Be quicker.	Apr 21, 2006 6:39 AM
61	Not particular to this meeting, but in general: with a wide range of topics and very many people, the regular "line up at the mike" thing doesn't work very well, it would be better to limit audience feedback in the technical plenaries (don't go to the administrative anymore, I sleep better in my hotel room) to questions only and invite people to take part in any discussions beforehand so they actually	Apr 21, 2006 6:30 AM

Page 3, Q22. How could the Plenaries be of greater interest to you?		
	have some time to say something. Better chairing is always good.	
62	The plenary should be no different from a WG meeting (except bigger) Don't waffle. Waffle like that in a WG and you get shot down. Publish material in advance. Then the people who turn up can be expected to have read the I-Ds, and we can focus on the substance.	Apr 21, 2006 5:40 AM
63	less cookie talk, more technical issues...	Apr 21, 2006 5:12 AM
64	i think a lot of the status reporting material could be published on-line and people interested could read it. there is practically never any discussion of it (of any use). it is interesting to read, but not really worth plenary time.	Apr 21, 2006 5:10 AM
65	It is very important to keep in mind that lots of people in the plenary are not native english speakers, so having the technical presentation made by a native english speaker that talks in bursts makes it simply impossible to understand what he is talking about.	Apr 21, 2006 5:00 AM
66	I really liked EKR's presentation. I found the whining about NATs afterward to be really annoying. A more structured input approach is needed.	Apr 21, 2006 4:55 AM

Page 4, Q24. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.		
1	During breaks and for breakfast would like to get more fruits.	May 6, 2006 5:27 PM
2	Longer breakfasts	May 6, 2006 7:07 AM
3	-- Have the meeting in South-Asia sometime -- given the interest of the engineering community in that region in packet networking, I think this is an idea whose time has come.	May 5, 2006 4:30 PM
4	My biggest problem with IETF meetings is that there is rarely time for substantive technical discussions. I would vote for increasing the lengths of most sessions and, consequently, increasing the number of parallel sessions.	May 5, 2006 3:21 PM
5	More meetings within easy travel of Europe :-)	May 5, 2006 8:08 AM
6	Provide more hotle and restaurant information around the HQ hotel.	May 4, 2006 11:06 PM
7	I would like to see more time spent on technical discussing draft documents	May 4, 2006 4:06 PM
8	More meetings outside the US (i.e. continue the good habbit started last year...;-))	May 4, 2006 3:49 PM
9	Better food!	May 4, 2006 10:28 AM
10	Better advance scheduling; too many related meetings were scheduled on top of each other in Dallas. I'd also like to know about meeting locations with more notice.	May 3, 2006 1:40 PM
11	When the IETF meetings are in the USA, it#s difficult to get the visa. So, less meetings in the USA ???	May 3, 2006 10:46 AM
12	More ubiquitous wireless access	May 3, 2006 10:31 AM
13	better wireless connectivity.	May 2, 2006 5:44 PM
14	Make sure audio streaming works in ALL rooms. Make sure there is enough food in the morning (fruit/coffee does not count...) The Social was BEST EVER!	May 2, 2006 4:59 PM
15	More reliable wireless access, more vegetarian food selections, cookies at 3pm!	May 2, 2006 1:30 PM
16	Support at Dallas 65 was good, other than food runout issues noted earlier.	May 2, 2006 1:24 PM
17	More power supply in the session rooms.	May 2, 2006 11:13 AM
18	All things considered, I thought the Dallas meeting was quite good. The facility was far more spacious than some of the past (especially the hallways), which was REALLY HELPFUL. (Please keep this in mind for future venues!) I think that the organizers are doing quite a good job, personally, and that the problems that do occur (snacks, fast-talking plenary speakers, etc.) are minor compared to all the things that go well. Also, my personal opinion is that I would be willing to pay more to attend, if the extra money can be used to fund the IETF or to improve the meeting experience (meals, etc.). Keep up the good work.	May 2, 2006 10:35 AM
19	Greater discipline: chairs should not allow sessions to be side-tracked.	May 2, 2006 10:17 AM

Page 4, Q24. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.		
20	better remote presentation capabilities for the WG meetings including Voice/Audio and remote presentation. (Jabber is fine, but more would be great.)	May 2, 2006 9:13 AM
21	Reduce the risk of conflicting agendas considering the topics investigated by the WGs.	May 2, 2006 8:11 AM
22	1. Choose a location where more rooms are available 2. Video archives of all the working group meetings for the benefit of people who are unable to attend (either they couldn't make it to Montreal, or had a clash with another meeting).	May 2, 2006 5:43 AM
23	I like the fact IETF is getting more organized. There is still work to do on that area. I would go for even more formalized document handling & submission process.	May 2, 2006 2:56 AM
24	Reduce the politics in IETF. The amount of politics is and back scratching is so high, sooner or later most people will stop participating in these meetings and discussion.	May 2, 2006 2:04 AM
25	I would like some meetings to be held in Asia	May 1, 2006 11:28 PM
26	Organize them in India	May 1, 2006 11:21 PM
27	Please start the WG meetings either late Monday, or end them Thursday. Traveling for 6 days is tough on people with kids. Also, video would be nice - like eat our own dog food with SIP or RTSP. :)	May 1, 2006 6:09 PM
28	I would like to see new chairs for speermint that actually respond to the group's needs, not just to fulfill their company agenda's against the wishes of the working group.	May 1, 2006 6:08 PM
29	Pls make sure breakfast is available until 9am!	May 1, 2006 6:07 PM
30	Thanks for asking. I'm sure I'll think of more things later, so making it easy to provide these sorts of comments in the future would be good. In a few sessions there were speakers who used a lavalier microphone by holding it with their hand near their mouth. The result was that the audio in the room was way too loud (15 dB or more), their fricatives were even louder, and every P produced an annoying pop over the speaker system. Lavalier microphones should *never* be used this way, as they have built in emphasis for high frequencies to make them sound natural when held or mounted near the sternum. In one meeting room the gain was not turned up high enough and when the speaker started by holding the microphone in the proper place (near the sternum) they were told by someone to hold the mic closer, which resulted in popping P's and audio that was too loud. I doubt the IETF could afford what it would take to avoid this problem copmletely (an audio technician on-duty in each room) but perhaps one on-duty audio techniction circulating among the 6 meeting rooms and educating the WG chairs about how to use the audio systems properly, as well as making sure the gains are set right would do much to improve this situation.	May 1, 2006 5:14 PM
31	early WG schedule availability lower fees	May 1, 2006 4:10 PM
32	Find a hotel which has many restaurants nearby. If the hotel room has the IETF WIFI access, that's a big bonus. Provide sufficient food for the breakfast and	May 1, 2006 3:33 PM

Page 4, Q24. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.		
	afternoon snacks.	
33	More breakfast. Consistently good power.	May 1, 2006 3:15 PM
34	- Easy Internet Access in the guest room - More power extention availability in the WG meeting rooms - Stable wireless connections in the meeting rooms	May 1, 2006 2:48 PM
35	Getting the Monday schedule to finish by 8pm instead of 10pm is a big improvement. Let people list some number (say 5) sessions they want most to attend when they register, and then input this to a clustering algorithm to help reduce conflicts.	May 1, 2006 2:46 PM
36	WiFi is still flaky for an 802.11b onboard user (no a/g available on my laptop).	May 1, 2006 2:21 PM
37	Please host the meeting in downtown urban areas, so we can walk to restaurants in the evenings.	May 1, 2006 1:57 PM
38	Not completely overbooking the WG training session might be useful. I RSVPed, then tried to attend, and couldn't get in the room.	May 1, 2006 1:40 PM
39	Fees proportional to attendance days. (This is important for people who only have a couple of sessions of interest.)	May 1, 2006 1:35 PM
40	I'm not so happy with the new schedule that makes people wait until late for dinner. I don't think it will really have the desired effect in getting more people to come to the plenaries. I think having plenaries that have topics people want to hear about or must be at because important decisions are made (such as happens at IEEE 802 meetings) is more likely to cause attendance to increase.	May 1, 2006 12:38 PM
41	Publish list of restaurants and locations (i.e. how close). This would allow beter determination if a car rental is needed.	May 1, 2006 12:18 PM
42	no "overview" presentations in working groups, assume everyone has read the drafts, if people keep commenting at the mics and haven't even read the drafts, then the chairs should silence them	May 1, 2006 11:56 AM
43	None	May 1, 2006 8:38 AM
44	would like to see social event in a place where people can have conversations. In Dallas the music was simply tooooooo loud.	Apr 29, 2006 1:35 AM
45	More room power. Plain and/or fruit-on-bottom yogurt (pre-mixed such as Yoplait is way too sweet).	Apr 28, 2006 5:39 PM
46	As mentioned previously, smaller amounts of communal verbal-masturbatory drek.	Apr 28, 2006 11:26 AM
47	a meeting reasonably in every other country before coming back to the same country. IETF would lose audience but gain technical interest.	Apr 28, 2006 9:39 AM
48	Use all of Friday to reduce amount of parallel sessions. Wireless network longer on Friday. In Dallas there were at least IRTF meetings after the wireless disappeared at noon	Apr 28, 2006 9:33 AM

Page 4, Q24. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.		
49	I think the format of the actual WG meetings should be changed. Most of the work is evidently done semi-privately among a handfull of active participants. At the WG meeting, the results are presented and it is very hard to get any technical understanding of what is going on. I think the WG meetings should be in the form of a roundtable of up to 10 participants, each with a microphone, actually discussing the technical topics, and the rest of the room can be a passive audience. I am pretty sure that the 'round table' discussions do occur, involving most of the right people, but they occur offline, in a restaurant or at an informal gathering known only to the 'inner circle'. So what I am suggesting is that we simply formalize the round-table discussions and allow an audience to benefit from listening in. Also, I think there should be many more technical tutorials. Most people at the IETF are only there for one or two WG's that they are interested in. The sessions outside of one's immediate interest, become places to sit and read email, and maybe casually look up at the speaker once in a while. The round-table discussion outlined above would make these 'outside my specific interest area' meetings much more worthwhile to attend, but even more worthwhile would be to have tutorials put on by the various Areas, where maybe at least one tech tutorial is always available as a session choice. I would much rather learn something about a topic I know nothing about, than to sit through listening to someone say "we moved the section on xyz to the end, and added some text that references compliance with RFC nnnn...". I guess what I am saying is, there is virtually no worthwhile content presented at the WG meetings, particularly for a 'newcomer'. As far as I can tell, there is not much more to be gained from reading mailing list messages either. You've got to be a 'member of the club' to get anything out of these meetings - and even then, what you do get, comes from collaborations and meetings that are outside of the official IETF agenda.	Apr 28, 2006 9:21 AM
50	co-lo with hotel #1 pref. when not colo, please expose why it was best choice. some kind of booking system for off-agenda meetings apart from 'beg AD to beg marsha to organize it' joint sessions for interesting converged WG	Apr 28, 2006 3:48 AM
51	continued good wireless coverage is important. IETF 65 was the best in a long time.	Apr 27, 2006 10:07 AM
52	don't hold it in dallas again, especially not during flood season.	Apr 27, 2006 7:28 AM
53	This blue sheet subscription in every meeting is boring. What do you think about, when every participant gets an 4 digit number and has only to write down this number on the blue sheet. This would simplify the process a lot.	Apr 27, 2006 7:04 AM
54	more power outlets in the room.	Apr 27, 2006 6:07 AM
55	No more meeting venus in the middle of nowhere (like Dallas) -- it's much more fun to be in a city. I guess Montreal will be better in this regard...	Apr 27, 2006 3:35 AM
56	More food and drink at and between breaks. (Yokohama is a good model). Its nice to not have to worry about when you need to get food, so working group work can be a priority and you can "graze" when you have an opportunity.	Apr 26, 2006 10:26 PM
57	Earlier announcement of meeting location/city.	Apr 26, 2006 6:10 PM
58	More power. Don't screw up the wireless! it worked in Dallas, much better than	Apr 26, 2006 5:32 PM

Page 4, Q24. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.		
	we have seen lately. I don't know how to get tables into the bigger rooms, but I sure would like it. We should rethink plenaries. For example, much as I am interested in RFC editor statistics, I don't think they add enough value for the time they take. I like seeing the people there (face to name), but make it shorter. Same goes for IANA. Maybe a couple of stretch breaks? Maybe a comic? Oh well, I can ask!	
59	Lower price for hotel room (e.g. same or lower than my corporate rate). Less expensive hotels overall. The Anatole's website advertises "the most expensive private art collection in America". This should have been a clue that everything at that hotel would be expensive! Reduction in meeting fees (e.g. back to $500 or lower). Reduce the number of Secretariat staff on-site (to save costs). I wouldn't mind waiting an extra 5 minutes to collect my badge if it would save a few thousand dollars of travel and living costs for the Secretariat staff.	Apr 26, 2006 5:25 PM
60	More cross area meetings, better scheduling of inter-related work. Area meetings early, WG to follow so folks can attend new meetings as work begins to effect their areas of interest.	Apr 26, 2006 5:15 PM
61	stable wireless network and enough power strips.	Apr 26, 2006 4:31 PM
62	In general, meetings held in facilities other than the meeting hotel have turned out to be a poor idea relative to general communications and discussions. Also, the notion of posting only one hotel with no real location information, etc., should not set a precedent.	Apr 26, 2006 3:46 PM
63	I would like to see presentation material made available on the web site 2 weeks in advance.	Apr 26, 2006 12:54 PM
64	Signs outside each of the rooms indicating the schedule / topic for the day.	Apr 26, 2006 12:44 PM
65	run it like Dallas, more uniform power availability in the rooms.	Apr 26, 2006 12:31 PM
66	Having WiFi in hotel is a major benefit. Having good WiFi in meetings (like Dallas) is critical. Better (healthful) food for breakfast would be nice but not critical. Meetings until 8 pm without a dinner break is tough for me. I preferred the old schedule unless the city (like Paris) is incompatible.	Apr 26, 2006 11:50 AM
67	Not too many changes, Plenaries are overrated and I would like to see them shurunk to one, have the IESG and IAB plenaries alternate meetings.	Apr 26, 2006 11:48 AM
68	The price on the hotels has gotten out of hand. In general, the IETF meetings should not be nor appear to be a boondongle. There should never be reasons for bringing along a spouse and family. This may be a policy change - I may be a good thing to plan for a small (say 5 or less) design meetings that would run Friday and Saturday. There should be a separate (and much smaller, say $100) fee for people that attend just the design meeting. These design meetings propose is to accelerate progress. One or two WG meetings at the IETF are generally not enough. I saw so much talking past each other and reluctance to change prepared presentations, even if before the presentation, major problems were shown (in private) to the presenter. (Note: I've been attending IETF meetings since 1990, and have missed only two.)	Apr 26, 2006 11:46 AM

Page 4, Q24. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.		
69	wlan in _all_ rooms.	Apr 26, 2006 10:45 AM
70	I find that the meetings have lately been meeting and often exceeding my expectations. This compares to years of working around little gotchas, like poor power or bad wireless or heating problems. I applaud the meeting organizers and the IT volunteers for bringing consistency to the meetings. I would like to see increased use of automated tools in conjunction with the meetings, following the path that has already been embarked on. Keep up the good work.	Apr 26, 2006 10:35 AM
71	Liked tables at the front in some rooms. Would like to see more of these. However, in one room, only half had power bars -- so people only used half the tables. Also, perhaps provide wired access at tables -- gives better performance and reduces load on wireless network. No room map in small-format agenda. Would really like to see one, since I don't normally use the large-format agenda. Map in large format agenda was very hard to read. In general, I have often found it hard to find meeting rooms the first few days. Would be nice if this could be improved somehow. Perhaps better signs? Perhaps divide the map into areas (e.g., downstairs left, downstairs right, upstairs, etc) and list the area name in the agenda next to the session so one knows where on the map to look for the room? Perhaps station hotel staff at various places just before sessions start on Monday to direct people? Of course, this entire survey just deals with the physical aspects of running the meeting. There are also the changes to make IETF meetings more effective. However, this topic is presumably out of scope for this survey. Perhaps a separate survey on this topic would be useful/informative?	Apr 25, 2006 2:52 PM
72	food at the first afternoon break	Apr 25, 2006 2:26 PM
73	Disappointed that IETF66 venue is not all-in-one venue, with hotel and meeting rooms split. Minneapolis is actually a great venue... good hotel and meeting rooms, good eating choices, good food available a short way down the inter-building tubes. Having the meeting hotel away from the venue is bad, bad, bad (Vienna was the worst by far).	Apr 25, 2006 7:08 AM
74	it is nice that the registration process already started and i appreciates very much , and for international participators with in Invitation letter (hard copy posted after payment) IETF registration office will provide a ID card (along with the pic) for coming participator's , it will be helpful for participators in many places up to back to home. And who really participate in voluntary (own expenses) mark them for more care form IETF registration office.	Apr 25, 2006 2:56 AM
75	Registration desk should stay open later on Sunday and/or open earlier on Monday. Or at least do something to ameliorate the Monday morning rush. Don't run out of food.	Apr 24, 2006 4:29 PM
76	Cheaper rooms	Apr 24, 2006 3:58 AM
77	I was very unhappy having to go around with "Nokia" written in big letters on my chest. I certainly appreciate their sponsorship of this event, but you need to draw the line somewhere.	Apr 23, 2006 5:48 PM
78	Rooms with different arrangements (open-square, herringbone) for smaller groups is nice. Fancier audio where you don't have to pass the mic, but still can	Apr 23, 2006 5:10 PM

Page 4, Q24. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.		
	be heard on the audio stream, would be fabulous. Avoid convention centers; I hate walking.	
79	Closer and more varied food options. Preferably at prices that are not "captured audience robbery rates".	Apr 23, 2006 2:41 PM
80	Find ways to reduce cost: hotel rates are the biggest factor here. I'm willing to pass up meeting-provided food IF there's a reduction in meeting fees.	Apr 23, 2006 5:10 AM
81	I would like to point out the great things of the last meetings that I would like not to change: 1. Having a few rows of tables in the meeting rooms is absolutely great. 2. The schedule with meetings finishing around 8pm is also wonderful and (perceivedly) contributes to productivity.	Apr 22, 2006 12:59 PM
82	Food that won't push me further towards developing diabetes.	Apr 22, 2006 6:43 AM
83	Not in the middle of no-where. Outside the United States - visas are too difficult.	Apr 21, 2006 4:24 PM
84	Decide the final agenda more than a month in advance, so people can plan their travel better. Announce the location well in advance of the meeting - because IETF happens so frequently, it's easy for it to completely stomp my other travel plans. Try to have meetings in places that are convenient to good restaurants. Minneapolis is kind of boring, but it's good in this way (although the *other* Hilton in Minneapolis is more central). The Vancouver location was outstanding in this regard - if we could have more IETFs there it would be great. It would be nice to have an IETF in India... :')	Apr 21, 2006 1:25 PM
85	keep session schedule as is. more power on all sides of meeting rooms (inconsistent in Dallas). liked the tables in the first 3 rows. look into getting 7-8 free/donated laptops for the machine that's connected to the projector, so that chairs can take their own notes, and time isn't lost fumbling with cables of individual's laptops. This will force all individuals to upload presos so the IETF laptop will be the viewer machine off the IETF website.	Apr 21, 2006 1:13 PM
86	I dislike the later dinners and three consecutive afternoon sessions. By the last session I'm worthless. I really liked the old approach of having a dinner break and a night session.	Apr 21, 2006 1:12 PM
87	We're still not getting the conference/hotel/restaurant mix right. The restaurant situation in Dallas was somewhat problematic and the conference/hotel separation in Montreal is a big part of my decision not to attend - I still remember the last time, and having a somehwat closer hotel is NOT sufficient.	Apr 21, 2006 12:50 PM
88	Agenda available much, much, much earlier. Enough breakfast / snacks for everyone. Wireless access everywhere. Power everywhere (including hotel restaurants, bar and public areas). Downtown location with good transport links. Encourage female attendance?	Apr 21, 2006 11:47 AM
89	- location: more central, where I can go out of the hotel and walk and find restaurants and shops. - more plugs in the meeting rooms	Apr 21, 2006 11:12 AM
90	Onsite registration late on Sunday nite and/or don't restrict entry to the terminal room on sunday nite for those who have not registered. I usually arrive on	Apr 21, 2006 11:06 AM

Page 4, Q24. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.		
	Sunday after registration closes. I sometimes want to go to the terminal room in order to have *both* power and network access, as well as to connect with others who hang out there. But I have been refused due to not having a badge. Firm up the Friday schedule long enough in advance that it can be used to determine airline registrations. I often plan a late departure on Friday, or stay till Saturday, "just in case". Usually I am just wasting time on Friday afternoon.	
91	Jabber-scribing should be made much easier: jabber-scribes need fully dependable networking; and a way should be worked out to share the duties. Channeling should never interrupt jabber-scribing. Audio should be dependable enough that jabber-scribes don't need to repeat everything a speaker says. Wireless in general has been too flaky, especially on Mondays. It might help to debug it on Sundays.	Apr 21, 2006 10:20 AM
92	the meetings need to be more productive. meetings are too often used for presentations, rather than discussion. too many people are sitting in the room typing on laptops for effective discussion to be taken place. my immediate suggestion is to schedule two kinds of sessions - presentation sessions and discussion sessions. presentation sessions should be held first, with some sort of break in between. they can try to get everyone on the same page for discussions. laptops should be forbidden in discussion sessions except for the discussion moderator, chairs, and jabber scribe. suggest this to WG chairs and see if two or three will volunteer to try this for their WGs in Montreal - see if they think it will be helpful. the problem with this is that it requires more meeting slots, but maybe if WGs start organizing this way they'll make more effective use of meeting time.	Apr 21, 2006 10:03 AM
93	I really like the "wireless everywhere." It would be great if we could always get the hotel Internet included in the IETF Internet. Even better would be to get the alternate hotels tied in.	Apr 21, 2006 9:15 AM
94	More transparency into why venues are chosen that appear to be suboptimal. E.g, lack of food within walking distance. Or in case of Montreal, why venue and hotels are not co-located. I.e., we seem to repeat making poor choices, and its unclear to what degree "requirements" are being followed.	Apr 21, 2006 8:56 AM
95	Finalize the Agenda sooner - BOFs should be the last thing scheduled, with a full understanding of the topics that they conflict with. ADs should be able to list the WG session conflicts that they can live with early-on.	Apr 21, 2006 8:34 AM
96	Someone (Andy?) once suggested to shorten the IETF meetings to just 2-3 days and use the remaining time to actually do work on open problems. Many meetings have become status reports where some active people simply inform the WG present in the room what is happening. In many cases, open issues are explained but there is no time to solve them and thus things are just deferred to the list. For me, travelling to status reports is not cost and time effective and audio/jabber works well enough to monitor things.	Apr 21, 2006 8:26 AM
97	(1) Some agendas not available until a few days before the meeting (WAY after the "cutoff"). Please cancel meetings that don't have agendas (you should only have to do this once). (2) Not asking for the moon, only for a large asteroid - would be nice to have wireless (so, Jabber) until the end of the (non-IETF) meeting slot on Friday afternoon, even if it only covers that meeting area.	Apr 21, 2006 8:16 AM

Page 4, Q24. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.		
	Understand that everyone wants to unplug, pack, and go!	
98	- Breakfast - A more useful plenary (not a waste of time) - A better Wireless Network	Apr 21, 2006 7:54 AM
99	Would have preferred the Intercontinental as the hotel.	Apr 21, 2006 7:38 AM
100	There needs to be a cap on the price going up all the time. The meetings should not be held in locations where people from large countries practically cannot attend due to Visa problems (e.g., US).	Apr 21, 2006 7:03 AM
101	More cookies for EKR.	Apr 21, 2006 6:40 AM
102	Stop the price hikes! Something I really miss is a way to get informed about what's happening in working groups that I have some interest in, but not enough to be on the mailinglist. So 15 minutes presenting progress to the rest of the IETF would be great. Please do something about all the overlap. It costs 1500 - 2000 euros/dollars to attend an IETF meeting, it's ridiculously frustrating to spend this money and a week's time only to find out that all the stuff I'm interested in overlaps.	Apr 21, 2006 6:34 AM
103	Not in USA.	Apr 21, 2006 6:12 AM
104	use the plenaries for disseminating common trends in technical specifications, instead of discussing the usual endless personal or administrative issues. to many WG do not know what the others are doing, and instead of conforming to ommon solutions, re-invent things from scratch.	Apr 21, 2006 5:58 AM
105	Better food and more food, please!	Apr 21, 2006 5:54 AM
106	Easier remote participation. Even if it is pretty good today, it could be worked on more. Thanks!	Apr 21, 2006 5:51 AM
107	eating better, good breakfast	Apr 21, 2006 5:44 AM
108	Hold them in a country that does not endorse torture.	Apr 21, 2006 5:41 AM
109	This was the first meeting which I came away from without any substantive complaints. The network worked; none of the sessions I attended was overcrowded; the `Paris' schedule (no sessions after dinner) was used. Good work!	Apr 21, 2006 5:06 AM
110	Aside from making them free, of course, which I fully appreciate is as impractical as it is desirable, I'd be curious as to whether the ADs could provide a rundown of their WG activities aimed at cross-pollination between areas in advance, say a couple of weeks before.	Apr 21, 2006 5:03 AM
111	Better quality food. Although I now wonder if there is a hotel in North America that actually knows how to make a decent pot of coffee.	Apr 21, 2006 4:55 AM
112	o) come back to the situation before Paris with an evening session o) dash boards in meeting rooms o) possibility to organize seats such as to have configs more discussion friendly o) put the map of the meeting rooms on the meeting schedule received at the reg.desk (like it used to be the case) in big hotels not	Apr 21, 2006 4:55 AM

Page 4, Q24. Tell us what changes you would like at the Meetings.		
	always obvious to find way toward a specific room very quickly	
113	It is quite fine at the moment. Especially, the new schedule without the late session after an longer evening break is good.	Apr 21, 2006 4:53 AM