

Results of the User Survey of EuroView2010: "Visions of Future Generation Networks"

Joint ITG, ITC, and Euro-NF workshop co-located with official G-Lab status meeting
August 2nd – August 3rd 2010, Würzburg, Germany

The user survey was handed out and could also be taken online at:
<http://www3.informatik.uni-wuerzburg.de/euroview/2010/survey/>

Opinion rating scale: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Fair, 2=Bad, 1=Very bad

SECTION 1: Quality of the Workshop																			
<p>1. GENERAL RATING How do you rate the workshop overall? mean = 3.79; median = 4; std.dev. = 1.02</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>5</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21%</td><td>54%</td><td>9%</td><td>13%</td><td>3%</td> </tr> </table>	5	4	3	2	1	21%	54%	9%	13%	3%								
5	4	3	2	1															
21%	54%	9%	13%	3%															
<p>2. CONTENT RATING Have the topics been of interest for you? mean = 3.53; median = 4; std.dev. = 0.96</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>5</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11%</td><td>47%</td><td>29%</td><td>9%</td><td>4%</td> </tr> </table>	5	4	3	2	1	11%	47%	29%	9%	4%								
5	4	3	2	1															
11%	47%	29%	9%	4%															
<p>3. RELEVANCE OF THE TOPICS Are the topics of the workshop relevant/important for the Future Internet? mean = 3.69; median = 4; std.dev. = 1.20</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>5</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26%</td><td>44%</td><td>10%</td><td>13%</td><td>7%</td> </tr> </table>	5	4	3	2	1	26%	44%	10%	13%	7%								
5	4	3	2	1															
26%	44%	10%	13%	7%															
<p>4. TIME FOR TALKS AND DISCUSSIONS How do you rate the time assigned for talks and discussions? mean = 3.54; median = 4; std.dev. = 1.01 Comments by participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "I think that the workshop should be more selective, leading to slightly (e.g. +5 min) longer talks and more (e.g. +5 min) room for discussion." • "15 Min. is ok for presenting current work (most talks of the second day); 15 Min. is not enough for presenting results, so the first day there could be more time for talks. So what about having two parallel sessions?" • "Unfortunately, the demo session and the poster session took place in parallel and the time slot had only 45 minutes." • "I was not able to see a demo." • "the time schedule is rather tight" • "the time for watching the demos was too short." 	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>5</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15%</td><td>45%</td><td>23%</td><td>14%</td><td>3%</td> </tr> </table>	5	4	3	2	1	15%	45%	23%	14%	3%								
5	4	3	2	1															
15%	45%	23%	14%	3%															
<p>5. MOST INTERESTING SESSION, TALK AND DEMO? What was the most interesting session in your opinion?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>Session 1: Prototypes and Testbeds</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Session 2: GENI</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Session 3: Architectures and Convergence</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Session 4: New Protocols and Interfaces</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Session 5: Routing and Security</td> <td style="text-align: right;">14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Session 6: Future Internet Activities in FP7</td> <td style="text-align: right;">11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Session 7: Virtualization</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Session 8: Wireless and Mobile Services</td> <td style="text-align: right;">11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Demo Session and Poster Session</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20%</td> </tr> </table>		Session 1: Prototypes and Testbeds	2%	Session 2: GENI	20%	Session 3: Architectures and Convergence	5%	Session 4: New Protocols and Interfaces	9%	Session 5: Routing and Security	14%	Session 6: Future Internet Activities in FP7	11%	Session 7: Virtualization	8%	Session 8: Wireless and Mobile Services	11%	Demo Session and Poster Session	20%
Session 1: Prototypes and Testbeds	2%																		
Session 2: GENI	20%																		
Session 3: Architectures and Convergence	5%																		
Session 4: New Protocols and Interfaces	9%																		
Session 5: Routing and Security	14%																		
Session 6: Future Internet Activities in FP7	11%																		
Session 7: Virtualization	8%																		
Session 8: Wireless and Mobile Services	11%																		
Demo Session and Poster Session	20%																		

What was the most appealing demo?

A QoE-Aware P2P Streaming System based on Scalable Video Coding	22%
A Demonstrator for Cross-Layer Composition	19%
Improvements to LISP Mobile Node Including NAT Traversal	19%
An Initial Prototype of Multi-Connection TCP Transport	11%
Hybrid Adaptive Mobile Multicast - Communicating via the HAMcast Middleware	11%
YouTube QoE-Aware Gateway Selection in Future Wireless Networks	11%
FIRMS - Demonstration of a Mapping System for Loc/ID Split Internet Routing in G-Lab	7%
A Testbed-based Visualization of Misbehavior in Peer-to-Peer System	0%
Demonstrating Forwarding on Gates with First Applications	0%

Who gave the most interesting talk in your opinion?

Michael Welzl	(Session 4) How to Truly Improve the Internet's Transport Layer	25.0%
Eleni Palkopoulou	(Session 3) Rethinking Homing Architectures	11.1%

In addition, there have been 7 talks with 5.56% and 9 talks with 2.78%.

SECTION 2: Organization of the Workshop

6. PRE-WORKSHOP ORGANIZATION

How do you rate the pre-workshop organization?
mean = 4.27; median = 5; std.dev. = 1.07

5	4	3	2	1
58%	26%	6%	7%	3%

7. LOCAL AND ON-SITE ORGANIZATION

How do you rate the on-site organization?
mean = 4.12; median = 5; std.dev. = 1.20

5	4	3	2	1
51%	31%	3%	9%	6%

Comments by participants

- “Network was terrible in over all conference”
- “wireless access should be improved”
- “The network connectivity was a bit weird. “
- “Wifi access was quite a problem...”
- “The local-organization was also excellent, except the WLAN problems. “
- “WLAN should work. The obvious problem with the WLAN ... this should not happen ;)”
- “please ensure that the WiFi service is up to the challenge”

8. REFRESHMENTS (COFFEE BREAKS, LUNCH)

How do you rate the coffee breaks and lunch?
mean = 4.00; median = 4; std.dev. = 1.16

5	4	3	2	1
44%	32%	10%	10%	4%

Comments by participants

- “coffee, drinks and snacks throughout the entire workshop.
- “Drinks and cookies should not have been taken away during sessions. “

9. SOCIAL EVENT

How do you rate the social event?
mean = 4.37; median = 5; std.dev. = 1.38

5	4	3	2	1
79%	5%	2%	2%	12%

Comments by participants

- “Food at social event could've been better.”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The tour at the social event was very interesting.” <p>10. PROCEEDINGS Are the printed abstracts and the online slides sufficient as proceedings? mean = 3.86; median = 4; std.dev. = 1.39</p> <p>Comments by participants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Proceedings on USB stick are a good addition since electronic versions of the abstract are more usable after the workshop than the printed ones.” • “Proceedings are not needed at all! Talks on USB is sufficient.“ • “Regarding the Proceedings, it would be nice to have some more constraints on how the formattings of the extended abstracts are to be submitted (even though it looks way better than last year's).” 	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>45%</td> <td>28%</td> <td>5%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>11%</td> </tr> </table>	5	4	3	2	1	45%	28%	5%	11%	11%
5	4	3	2	1							
45%	28%	5%	11%	11%							

SECTION 3: Personal Outcome and Impressions#

<p>11. PERSONAL EXPERIENCE How many conferences/workshops on Future Internet have you attended, including this one?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td>#workshops</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> <td>≥10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#participants</td> <td>1</td> <td>14</td> <td>7</td> <td>15</td> <td>7</td> <td>6</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </table> <p>EuroView participants already attended at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APCC2009 • Euroview2006 - Euroview2009 • Experimental Facility Workshop, Kaiserslautern (Mar 2010) • FDNA • FIA Events at Brussels, Cologne, etc • GECx • ICC 2009 NGN Symposium • IEEE P2P • IFIP Networking • IMS Workshop 2009 • ISOC • IST Mobile Summit 2008 Stockholm • KuVS workshop on "Future Internet" • Münchner Kreis: Diverse CeBIT Conferences Bitkom: Diverse TÜV RHEINLAND: Diverse • NGI 2010 • ReArch • e-Energy • Tridentcom • VDE photnets • Workshop on Future Internet Architecture (in context of Euro-NF) • Workshops at ICC/GC/OFC 	#workshops	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	≥10	#participants	1	14	7	15	7	6	2	2	2	1	4	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>41%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> </table>	5	4	3	2	1	2%	38%	41%	11%	8%
#workshops	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	≥10																								
#participants	1	14	7	15	7	6	2	2	2	1	4																								
5	4	3	2	1																															
2%	38%	41%	11%	8%																															
<p>12. INSPIRATION The workshop inspired new ideas for my work.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>41%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> </table>	5	4	3	2	1	2%	38%	41%	11%	8%																								
5	4	3	2	1																															
2%	38%	41%	11%	8%																															

<p>mean = 3.14; median = 3; std.dev. = 0.93</p>											
<p>13. COLLABORATION The workshop inspired joint projects, development, or joint publications. mean = 3.30; median = 3.5; std.dev. = 1.18</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16%</td> <td>35%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> </table>	5	4	3	2	1	16%	35%	23%	18%	8%
5	4	3	2	1							
16%	35%	23%	18%	8%							
<p>14. SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT There is enough opportunity for socializing and personal discussions. mean = 3.83; median = 4; std.dev. = 1.12</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30%</td> <td>42%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>11%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> </table>	5	4	3	2	1	30%	42%	12%	11%	5%
5	4	3	2	1							
30%	42%	12%	11%	5%							
<p>15. AUDIENCE How do you rate the mix between academia and industry? mean = 3.71; median = 4; std.dev. = 1.11</p> <p>Comments from participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I wonder about so few participants from vendor companies, network operators and service providers. Are they not interested in Future Internet or are they not competent enough to follow technically ? “ • “industry attendance appears to be decreasing” • “there were only relatively few partners from the industry, but Future Internet seems to be mainly a topics for academia (no deployment in the next two or three years) , so this is ok.” • “Ensure that IP players (Cisco, Juniper, Huawei) and IT players (HP, IBM, ...) are there as well.” 	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26%</td> <td>40%</td> <td>16%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> </table>	5	4	3	2	1	26%	40%	16%	15%	3%
5	4	3	2	1							
26%	40%	16%	15%	3%							
<p>16. ATTENDANCE AT NEXT WORKSHOPS Would you come to another EuroView workshop?</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>yes</td> <td>no</td> <td>missing answer</td> </tr> <tr> <td>80%</td> <td>0</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> </table>	yes	no	missing answer	80%	0	20%				
yes	no	missing answer									
80%	0	20%									
<p>17. OUTCOME OF WORKSHOP What is your personal outcome of the workshop?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Social networking, i.e., meet some people.” • “It was a nice opportunity to meet some friends and stay in touch with the German academic community.” • “useful update on recent developments ideas; always a pleasure to be in Würzburg” • “I met some new people to work with.” • “Get more in touch with the German community on my field of research. Discussion with them was stimulating” • “Some more ideas about future work; got in contact with some good researchers.” • “A very nice workshop at a time when people usually go on holidays. No bad timing, as this contributes to the relaxed mood of many participants. As said before, technical contents needs improvement.” • “Met with some of the GENI people.” • “Contacts and survey of current activities” • “communication and cooperations.” • “Remarkable list of invited speakers (compared to the size of the conference). Meeting them personally was much more important than the usually very abstract keynote talks” 											

SECTION 4: Proposal for Improvement#

18. KEYNOTE SPEAKERS, SPECIALISTS, INTERNATIONAL INITIATIVES

Which outstanding keynote speakers, specialists, or representatives of international initiatives on Future Internet would you like to invite?

- “Representatives from Internet industry (Cisco, Juniper, ...) would be interesting”
- The following keynote speakers were mentioned (complete list):
 - Admela Jukan
 - Albert Greenberg
 - Chip Elliot
 - Darleen Fisher
 - Henning Schulzrinne
 - Jennifer Rexford
 - Joe Touch
 - John Day
 - Jon Crowcroft
 - Jon Turner
 - Larry Landweber
 - Lars Eggert
 - Phuoc Tran-Gia
 - Rob Sherwood
 - Robert Morris
 - Van Jacobson
 - Zach Shelby

19. NOVEL TOPICS

Which novel topics would you like to have included additionally in EuroView2010?
(The items are sorted alphabetically with some participants' comments in brackets.)

- Cognitive radio ("more attention to wireless issues, e.g. cognitive radio")
- Cyber-physical systems
- Datacenters
- Economic aspects of the Internet (“Another topic which could be addressed in the future is the economic aspect of the internet; are flat rates really sufficient and fair or do we need a load and QoS dependent charging?”)
- High-speed routers/switches
- Infrastructure-less communication in large scale catastrophe scenarios
- Internet of Things
- Nodal multilayer integration
- Ontology for network services ("I felt a strong tendency towards service and network description languages. Maybe one should look into ontology for network services a bit more.")
- OpenFlow
- Smart Grid topics
- Use cases for federation
- Wireless Multi-Hop Networks
- Wireless Sensor Networks (6LoWPAN)

20. SUGGESTIONS

Could you suggest ways to improve the quality, visibility, success, ... of EuroView2011?

- "Video presentation would be fine"
- "more time for visits"
- "more room for discussions without active tracks"
- "Increase international visibility, e.g., write a report in CCR" (CCR = Computer Communication Review)
- "Invite local students more directly."

Detailed comments regarding the demo session:

- "more time for the demo session"
- " 2 or 3 demo session instead of one long demo - more time for talks - use the third day also for talks/demos"
- "improve demo session"
- "improve Demo-Session. Less Demos and more time!"
- "Leave more room (time) for the demos. Do not have the demo session across lunchtime."
- "The slot for the demo session was unluckily chosen. After lunch, nobody had time to look at our demo as the regular sessions took place. That gave a kind of feeling as we had invested weeks of hard work for just 15 minutes..."

Detailed comments regarding the review process:

- "I suppose EuroView's quality and visibility may be improved with a regular peer-review process and perhaps short papers that may be four pages long. I was somehow disappointed about the quality of some presentations that had a very low technical impact and a huge amount of very high-level talks."
- "I think that it would be possible to ask the ITG group for brief reviews of the extended abstracts, however this would compromise the workshop style. Maybe just the speakers should be encouraged stronger to present real work rather than statements of intention."
- "The review process for papers is a little bit unclear. Especially there is no feedback to the authors about the reviewer feedback."
- "Furthermore it might be of interest to provide feedback in form of a peer review process."

Detailed comments regarding the quality of the workshop

- "Too much focus on academic research, interesting industry talks were downgraded to posters. :("
- "Some talks were really not of high quality."
- "Content and quality of some talks was disappointing."
- "Many talks were not focused enough on "future internet" in my opinion."
- "The technical content of many presentations was surprisingly modest. Some form of review would probably help improving here."
- "I feel there is a lack of tangible progress / concrete results More talks on results, not just plans"