

Q2 Which track did you co-chair for the Tokyo Summit?

Answered: 29 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Enterprise IT Strategies	3.45%	1
Telco Strategies	6.90%	2
How to Contribute	10.34%	3
Planning Your OpenStack Cloud	3.45%	1
Containers	0.00%	0
User Stories	3.45%	1
Community	3.45%	1
Related OSS Projects	10.34%	3
Operations	10.34%	3
Cloud Security	3.45%	1
Compute	6.90%	2
Cloud Storage	6.90%	2
Cloud Networking	6.90%	2
Public & Hybrid Clouds	0.00%	0
Hands-On Labs	17.24%	5
Cloud Applications	0.00%	0
Cloudfunding: Startups and Capital	6.90%	2
Total		29

Q3 Currently there's no limit on the quantity of talks for which a person can be listed as a speaker. What new session quantity limitations per speaker do you think should be added to the platform?

Answered: 29 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
No change. Leave it the way it is.	37.93% 11
Set the maximum at 2 speaking submissions per person across all tracks.	6.90% 2
Set the maximum at 3 speaking submissions per person across all tracks.	24.14% 7
Set the maximum at 4 speaking submissions per person across all tracks.	31.03% 9
Set the maximum at 5 speaking submissions per person across all tracks.	6.90% 2
Set the maximum at 6 speaking submissions per person across all tracks.	0.00% 0
Set the maximum at 7 speaking submissions per person across all tracks.	0.00% 0
Set the maximum at 8 speaking submissions per person across all tracks.	0.00% 0
Other (please specify)	13.79% 4
Total Respondents: 29	

#	Other (please specify)	Date
1	Would be interested to see the data on this, are there instances where people are actually submitting more than 3-4 talks each?	9/9/2015 11:00 AM
2	Set the maximum at 6 speaking submissions per person with a maximum of 2 per track.	8/28/2015 9:21 AM
3	I don't think it's fair to limit submissions arbitrarily. Just highlight in the UI that one speaker is listed in other tracks (and link to them, so that chairs can investigate and form an opinion themselves)	8/24/2015 2:28 PM
4	4 seems like a nice round number, but ultimately the issue is less that people submit "too many" talks, and more than people submit the "same" talk worded slightly differently. That's really the problem I'd like to see solved, more than limiting someone who legitimately has a lot of good things to say	8/24/2015 2:12 PM

Q4 Currently an abstract of any length is permissible when you submit a talk in the Call for Speakers platform. What new abstract requirements do you think should be added to the platform?

Answered: 29 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
No change. Leave it the way it is.	17.24% 5
Set a minimum word count requirement and encourage people submit more detailed, lengthy abstracts	41.38% 12
Set a maximum word count requirement and encourage people to submit shorter, more concise abstracts	13.79% 4
Other (please specify)	27.59% 8
Total	29

#	Other (please specify)	Date
1	I would like to see two fields, a longer, detailed abstract which would be primarily for track chairs and talk selection purposes. And also a shorter description field which would be used for publishing in the conference schedule. "As a track chair..." I would want to have as much detail as possible about what the talk will cover, level of expertise, etc. "As a summit attendee..." I would like to have short (3-4 sentence) descriptions of talks that I can easily look at a glance when choosing which sessions to attend.	9/9/2015 11:00 AM
2	There should be both an upper and lower bound. We have been good about telling people how to submit a good abstract (The Women of OpenStack did a great recorded webinar) and there's no shortage of good advice on the Internet.	8/26/2015 10:05 PM
3	Set a maximum word count and encourage people submit abstracts with more details. Without the abstract details it is very difficult to select a talk for the summit. Too short of an abstract says to me that the person is not really interested in giving the talk.	8/25/2015 6:20 AM
4	If there's a way to keep the abstracts short but higher quality I'd be for it.	8/24/2015 7:07 PM
5	Don't put arbitrary limits. Bad abstracts are easy to spot: if someone submits an awful abstract too bad for them.	8/24/2015 2:28 PM
6	It's fine the way it is. I would not consider an abstract which is only 1 or 2 sentences anyway. I would not force submitters into concise abstracts; some people love details and they should not be punished for this. Submitters should be aware that it might be advisable to structure the abstract in a way that the main information about the proposed talk can be grasped by reading only the first 1-2 paragraphs.	8/24/2015 2:05 PM
7	My vote is for a max word count *because right now there are so many talks to review*. If we institute a stringent low-max-submissions-per-speaker policy as suggested in question 3, then detailed abstracts are fine, and I'd vote for no change.	8/24/2015 2:02 PM
8	Encourage people to complete abstracts that have some meaning and that tells us what they are planning to talk about!	8/24/2015 1:57 PM

Q5 Currently a talk can include any amount of speakers / panelists when you submit a talk in the Call for Speakers platform. What new speaker / panelist quantity limitations do you think should be added to the platform?

Answered: 29 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
No change. Leave it the way it is.	20.69% 6
Set a maximum of 3 speakers / panelists who can be included in talk	6.90% 2
Set a maximum of 4 speakers / panelists who can be included in talk	34.48% 10
Set a maximum of 5 speakers / panelists who can be included in talk	10.34% 3
Set a maximum of 6 speakers / panelists who can be included in talk	3.45% 1
Set a maximum of 7 speakers / panelists who can be included in talk	0.00% 0
Set a maximum of 8 speakers / panelists who can be included in talk	0.00% 0
Other (please specify)	24.14% 7
Total	29

#	Other (please specify)	Date
1	Don't know if this is absolutely necessary, but it does seem practical to limit to a total of 4-5 presenters.	9/9/2015 11:00 AM
2	3 speakers for speaking slots, but no limit for panels	8/25/2015 12:28 PM
3	So I think we need to distinguish between a panel and a presentation....presentations should have no more than 3, while panels maybe 6	8/25/2015 1:58 AM
4	Again, I'm against arbitrary limits. I'd be more inclined to inform track chairs that too many speakers are to be considered just a cheap trick to get a free ticket.	8/24/2015 2:28 PM
5	I liked the discussion on the mailing list about X speakers for a panel (and maybe even create a panel track) but in general limiting to one or two speakers for a "normal talk". Collaboration is good and I think it leads to better quality talks, but many more than that is difficult to get any real substance from any one person in the allotted time.	8/24/2015 2:12 PM
6	3 speakers tops for regular talks. Panels and hands-on-labs should be handled separately; there, 5 would be a reasonable maximum.	8/24/2015 2:02 PM
7	I personally like panels with casts of thousands. Bring them on.	8/24/2015 1:57 PM

OpenStack Track Chair Survey (Tokyo Summit)

Q6 In general please share your feedback on the current Call for Speakers submission process and provide your recommendations of what you think should be changed and why.

Answered: 16 Skipped: 13

#	Responses	Date
1	I would like to suggest adding an area for presenters to link to either a video or slideshare link of a previous presentation session from a FLOSS event. This will give more context to voters and track chairs.	8/28/2015 9:21 AM
2	I would definately set a maximum length and a maximum number of talks that a person can propose	8/27/2015 3:11 AM
3	I think there should be some multi-dimensionality to associating submissions to different categories, rather than one to one association of the abstract to one primary category. The tagging functionality was interesting to the end user, but there didn't seem to be a way to categorize a Docker talk for both the Related OSS and Containers track, for example (I know Containers was added later).	8/26/2015 10:05 PM
4	We have to welcome every call for speaker submission, so more better there is no restriction to entry. More important is guide the submitter to which is good and which is not good.	8/26/2015 9:26 AM
5	I am not familiar with this process.	8/25/2015 2:12 PM
6	Personally the system used to select submissions was very efficient and worked very well.	8/25/2015 6:20 AM
7	The Call for Speakers submission process is fairly good. Generally encouraging less talks of higher quality (people may be part of fewer proposals) will help the selection process both from a more diverse set of speakers and encouraging new speakers to step up.	8/24/2015 6:15 PM
8	I would love to see us rate presentations and have that serve as an additional data point. If attendees score a talk high or low we may want to consider that when selecting that speaker for the next summit.	8/24/2015 2:26 PM
9	I think the submission process is fine, one thing that would be helpful is contact info for submitters so that for example when I'm reviewing a proposal and it doesn't make sense or there are missing details it would be great to be able to contact the submitter and ask for more info.	8/24/2015 2:16 PM
10	I think being more transparent about how the votes work and what they count for would be useful. People will likely find ways to game the system no matter what, but most people don't understand that it's not sheer number of votes which leads to talks being selected. If they knew this, perhaps you'd get less "spam voting" which would give chairs making the choices a much more accurate view as to how many people are *actually* interested in any given talk.	8/24/2015 2:12 PM
11	I reckon the submission process is good as it is.	8/24/2015 2:05 PM
12	Please see http://lists.openstack.org/pipermail/openstack-track-chairs/2015-August/000134.html	8/24/2015 2:02 PM
13	Overall, the process is nice. I'd like to see more detailed abstracts as a requirement.	8/24/2015 2:01 PM
14	I think that there needs to be more emphasis on last minute track changes. Can it be automated so that track chairs are notified when a change is made to their track? I know that track chairs are reminded again and again to do changes by a certain date, but others (like me :)) don't. I noticed that changes are highlighted with a *NEW* and then an email was sent to all track chairs at the end, but maybe there could be a popup notification that lets you know that there are new sessions.	8/24/2015 1:57 PM
15	Love to see tools that would allow the track chairs for collaborate more. A way to eliminate obviously unsuitable or incomplete submissions would be great.	8/24/2015 1:57 PM
16	I would like to see people put more effort into describing their talks with better abstracts	8/24/2015 1:53 PM

OpenStack Track Chair Survey (Tokyo Summit)

Q7 Please let us know your feedback regarding the community voting process.

Answered: 24 Skipped: 5

#	Responses	Date
1	I was surprised how few votes there were (and therefore how few people actually participate in voting.) This does provide a helpful first-step metric for talk selection, but i question how valuable it is with so little participation.	9/9/2015 11:00 AM
2	It seems easy for votes to be gamed by large organizations and large organizations and their vendors (e.g. large organization tells their major suppliers to vote for them). This seems very far from an ideal situation if the track chairs weigh the votes too heavily.	9/2/2015 8:28 AM
3	Need to move talks between tracks during the voting process.	9/1/2015 3:06 PM
4	There is not much that can be done to eliminate "ballot stuffing" but, even with this fact, I would still encourage to keep community voting as a practice. It serves as another input that track chairs can use when evaluating the submissions. I think we should transparently tell the community (on the voting page) that votes only act as one of many factors in the decision making process. Finally, I wonder if we could possibly restrict each individual member to only being able to vote on 6 sessions? This would reduce the ability to "mass vote" for all sessions from large companies. I would also like to see a distribution curve of votes per track, this might help us identify outliers easily (average vote / number of votes per talk).	8/28/2015 9:21 AM
5	I think the community voting is useful but it shoudn't be taken too much into consideration when selecting the talks.	8/27/2015 3:11 AM
6	I still find it valuable as one factor in the decision process. I would like to sort the talks to select by its average rating.	8/26/2015 10:05 PM
7	There is no another way to hear from many people about submissions, so it is important process.	8/26/2015 9:26 AM
8	Track Chairs should be given information and guidance about how they should consider the vote results. i.e. warn people that votes can be a popularity contest sometimes.	8/25/2015 2:12 PM
9	Voting ran into a few issues with talks that couldn't be found by keyword searching. This didn't seem widespread, but was confusing for some proposers. Perhaps a special "keyword" or "tag" system to allow grouping talks by theme, instead of just track, would help? Eg, there could be talks about docker in the Enterprise, Telco, Ops, User stories, and Container tracks. Without a subject-based grouping, it is harder for voters to identify subject matter they want to vote on.	8/25/2015 12:28 PM
10	It has become clear that community voting is not balanced and can not be trusted. I would like to see honest community votes being submitted and not just individuals from the company of the speaker at hand. The community support/interest is very strong but, does not seem to be reflected in the votes. We need to figure out a way to get the community back more sincerely involved.	8/25/2015 6:20 AM
11	The big problem is SO many submissions...perhaps the way to solve this is not to limit the submissions but to improve the searching ability so I can set what I am interested in	8/25/2015 1:58 AM
12	It's not very effective.	8/24/2015 7:07 PM
13	Adding in more search capabilities and/or easier ways to see what companies and people are involved with what differing talks would help. There was also a large number of overlapping proposals.	8/24/2015 6:15 PM
14	Keep it as is: it's useless for selecting good tracks because title, abstract and bio of the speaker are a much better indicator of quality. The voting process is a nice celebration and tool for publicity.	8/24/2015 2:28 PM
15	I think it's fine. It allows members of the community to provide their input. I think the track chairs should consider it as one datapoint amongst many.	8/24/2015 2:26 PM
16	I think voting is important, but I also however feel that voting is broken. I say this based on the large majority of talks from HP, RedHat and IBM that had an exceptional number of votes, however the topic was unclear or specifically nothing more than a sales/marketing pitch. It's quite possible that I'm out of touch on the goals of these talks and maybe we do in fact want to encourage vendor marketing but I've typically tried to make selections based on informative talks around OpenStack, not how the product from "vendor-x" is the greatest thing to ever happen to OpenStack.	8/24/2015 2:16 PM

OpenStack Track Chair Survey (Tokyo Summit)

17	The process is fine, and I like the idea of people seeing the talks and folks promoting their own talks and the exposure for the overall project and community which comes from it, however I think there is definitely room to figure out how to solve the problem of people trying to game the system for personal gain (free pass, free marketing, etc.). I think we should continue to look into this issue and work on solutions, but I don't know that I have any specific changes I could speak to at this time.	8/24/2015 2:12 PM
18	It is fairly common among track chairs to give little to no credit to community voting. Personally I reckon it is ok to keep it as a way to advertise all proposed talks, but given the sheer amount of submission, it simply impossible to browse them and vote. However, I wonder how the average community member would feel knowing that his vote for a talk counts little to nothing towards the selection of said talk.	8/24/2015 2:05 PM
19	Also outlined in http://lists.openstack.org/pipermail/openstack-track-chairs/2015-August/000134.html	8/24/2015 2:02 PM
20	I don't value this process that much at all to be honest. It's easy to stuff the ballot here, and it's obvious when reviewing talks which companies stuffed their own talks ballot box. This basically doesn't have a lot of value from my perspective.	8/24/2015 2:01 PM
21	Personally, I don't think that the community voting means anything. I glance at the numbers, but they don't really influence my decision due to the sheer volume of sessions.	8/24/2015 1:57 PM
22	It is what it is. I actually am OK with it.	8/24/2015 1:57 PM
23	Hard to use the tooling to search and sort proposals.	8/24/2015 1:55 PM
24	While there are chances of the vote being "gamed", I feel the community vote is one of the factors that should help in deciding which talks should be selected	8/24/2015 1:53 PM

OpenStack Track Chair Survey (Tokyo Summit)

Q8 Please let us know your feedback regarding the track chair process for selecting presentations to be included in the final Summit schedule.

Answered: 17 Skipped: 12

#	Responses	Date
1	The track chairs that worked with me were very professional and easy to work with. I would prefer that we subjected the abstracts to academic style reviews.	9/2/2015 8:28 AM
2	I would like to suggest adding a structured approach to the track chair team composition. For example, can we move to having 4 track chairs per track and they represent 1 developers, 1 operator, 1 working group member, and 1 additional nominated track chair.	8/28/2015 9:21 AM
3	As I touched on a bit before, I'd like to see some sort of bridging between tracks. Sometimes it's not clear whether a talk should remain in the Related OSS track, or it should be moved to another track. I struggle to find an objective test that determines whether I should move, again, for example a Dockerization of OpenStack talk to the Containers track, or the catchall Operations track, or keep it in my own Related OSS track. Is there some middle ground of a "Potpourri" or union of multiple tracks we can all vote on together outside our own track siloes when it's not clear what track a talk belongs in?	8/26/2015 10:05 PM
4	I think the selecting schedule is slightly tight. But in fact, every process is tight, so it can't be avoidable...	8/26/2015 9:26 AM
5	I learned a lot about reading abstracts during my first time as a track chair. It would be nice to have that knowledge before selecting talks.	8/25/2015 2:12 PM
6	track chair process worked great with the distributed team	8/25/2015 12:28 PM
7	I had no issues with the process what so ever.	8/25/2015 6:20 AM
8	seemed fine	8/25/2015 1:58 AM
9	The selection process for the track chair was pretty good, the tool could use some enhancements (see feedback on #9)	8/24/2015 6:15 PM
10	The process was worked well over the last few summits. In the Hands on Track many of us have worked together in this capacity over the last few summits. This experience allows us to get sharper and sharper at this task.	8/24/2015 2:26 PM
11	The process makes a lot of sense to me. As one who didn't request to be on a chair (perhaps everyone is?) I'd be interested to know more about who nominates whom and what criteria are used. But all in all it was a very pleasant experience and I would absolutely love to take part again.	8/24/2015 2:12 PM
12	I don't think there are guidelines, are they? I have served in two different tracks for two different summits and in both cases we established guidelines on the flight. While I'm ok with a self-coordinating team, perhaps you might want to ensure common criteria are adopted across tracks. Also more time is needed for moving talks across tracks. We had a few talks added to our track our before deadline - with all the selections made and agreed upon by all track chairs.	8/24/2015 2:05 PM
13	Overall I believe it's working really well; the experience has been smooth sailing with excellent collaboration between the chairs, for the last 3 summits.	8/24/2015 2:02 PM
14	Overall, the process is smooth.	8/24/2015 2:01 PM
15	It's a good process. Again, the volume becomes an issue, but I think that having atleast 4-5 track chairs helps. I also think that it's beneficial to switch around a few track chairs each cycle to get different perspectives.	8/24/2015 1:57 PM
16	I have done this for a number of years. I enjoy it, but my co-chairs this year were a bit freaked out about the timing.	8/24/2015 1:57 PM
17	It is becoming increasing difficult to select talks due to the sheer number of submissions. There are also difficulties when some track chairs consider community votes to be important and some don't	8/24/2015 1:53 PM

Q9 Please let us know your feedback specifically on the track chair tool / platform that you used to review the sessions and make your individual and team selections. Do you find the tool functional or not? Are there any key features that should be added to the tool?

Answered: 27 Skipped: 2

#	Responses	Date
1	I would like to be able to have the following abilities in the track chair tool: - Sort talks by voting metrics - View individual and team selections on a single screen (for help reconciling individual selections into team selections) - In addition to the "add to my list", have a separate personal "do not consider" list for filtering out talks that are a definite "no"	9/9/2015 11:00 AM
2	The tool could support "hiding" talks that the team has collectively decided to exclude from further consideration. This might be able to happen automatically if all track chairs "voted" to have it hidden through the tool. It would be great if the talk titles and abstracts were in two frames--for example, the titles on the left, and the abstract in the center of the page to prevent continuous scrolling.	9/2/2015 8:28 AM
3	Track move was available too late to be effective - should happen during the voting process.	9/1/2015 3:06 PM
4	The tool is functional but there were definite gaps that could be addressed to make the tool a bit more track chair friendly. 1) Can we add the ability to sort the entries in the track by the various columns of data that are made available to us? 2) Can we have some icon or other way of identifying the sessions that track chairs suggested be moved but ended up staying within the track? The concern is that track chairs stop considering the session after it has been suggested that it should move. It would be nice to have some indicator that a session did not move so it can be given consideration before the final list is built by the track chair team. 3) Can we add a button to suggest sessions should be combined or a button to email the submitter for additional Q&A?	8/28/2015 9:21 AM
5	The tool is much better than last year. Good job! The only thing that I'd modify is that when you click on a talk to read the abstract it's showed at the bottom of the page, it's a bit hard to get there if the list of proposals is long. I'd show it at the right side.	8/27/2015 3:11 AM
6	It worked well, though I'd like to see the columns sortable, such as by average community vote. I know some people are against using that metric, but I rely on it as one factor and start my selections based on it.	8/26/2015 10:05 PM
7	The tool was great. But there was a bug with selection. I'm not sure it's depends on my web browsing environment or not, though.	8/26/2015 7:12 PM
8	Few improvements can be made: - Session list sorting - Have a way to remove talks from the list to make it easier to navigate and filter out talks you don't feel are interesting -	8/26/2015 12:58 PM
9	Sorting by voting score or other metrics. History of my view of proposal.	8/26/2015 9:26 AM
10	The tool was quite functional. I spent a lot of time clicking talks and scrolling up, to the top of the webpage. It would streamline the process if I didn't have to do that 150 times. What about a slide-show type view, where talks are ordered and you can click a 'next' button (better yet, a keyboard shortcut) to move to the next talk. I used google docs to manage my selections.	8/25/2015 2:12 PM
11	It wasn't clear what track changes were proposed, reviewed, or acted upon by anyone.	8/25/2015 12:28 PM
12	The tool functioned very well and I was impressed on how great of a tool it was for the selection process. I would add the feature of being able to add talks to personal lists where you can add notes during the pre-selection process. I did this in Evernote and would have been nice to do it right in the tool.	8/25/2015 6:20 AM
13	It worked well.	8/25/2015 1:58 AM
14	Would like a way to hide sessions that are not in contention to help pare down the list.	8/24/2015 7:07 PM

OpenStack Track Chair Survey (Tokyo Summit)

15	The track chair tool was a bit clunky. The lack of various sorting capabilities and some odd browser bugs made it hard to use. We ended up using a google docs for sorting and scoring prior to the final list. The browser "bug" was where you'd click on a talk and the talk would render at the top off the screen requiring a scroll up to see this was under FireFox on Ubuntu 15.04	8/24/2015 6:15 PM
16	Would be good to be able to sort by votes	8/24/2015 6:08 PM
17	In the UI I'd like to make the track I select as chair to go up, so that my top ones are on top and I don't have to scroll. This time we had to create one spreadsheet to put the individual selections and see which ones were common across all of us. If we could see that in the tool, we'd be done without spreadsheets.	8/24/2015 2:28 PM
18	I think the tools is great even though there are a few features on the wish list. I actually think the tool we used for the Vancouver summit was a little more polished then what we used for Tokyo. With that being said I find it functional. Would be great to order and sort by votes. Might be nice to tag talks with some metadata. For example, we make note of which companies speakers are from so that we can keep it balanced as much as possible.	8/24/2015 2:26 PM
19	Tool continues to improve in my opinion, one thing that would be great to have in the future is sort-by capability and an export to spreadsheet function.	8/24/2015 2:16 PM
20	By and large it was well thought out and full of useful information. I did find it annoying that the list of talks and the abstract for them were on the "same page", so as I went further down the list, I found myself scrolling up and down quite a lot. I tried to be unbiased about this, but found it took more motivation for me to read the abstracts lower down if the title didn't grab me because of the scrolling up and down which would be involved.	8/24/2015 2:12 PM
21	The tool worked very well for me. I thought the decision to not allow for sorting by community scoring was intentional and agreeable. Anyway, showing also the variance in community scoring might be a nice thing to have when characterizing the nature of the votes for a talk.	8/24/2015 2:05 PM
22	One thing I really missed this time around was the ability to order talks in the UI by votes cast, average rating, and total points. Even though we all agree that the community votes should not exclusively define the ranking and selection of talks, having this information at our fingertips would be quite helpful. Other than that, I found the current incarnation of the track chair tool quite handy and pleasant to work with.	8/24/2015 2:02 PM
23	The tool is ok. It has some minor hiccups, nothing major. The ability to get rid of a talk from view would be nice once you decide you won't schedule it.	8/24/2015 2:01 PM
24	My only wish would be more notifications around the new sessions.	8/24/2015 1:57 PM
25	See above. Need more functionality. I posted a copy of the spreadsheet I did to help with the process. Definitely need a way to sort on the columns.	8/24/2015 1:57 PM
26	Ability to filter by selected or sort by votes. Expose speakers or affiliation along with the title.	8/24/2015 1:55 PM
27	While the tool had greater functionality this year, I found the performance to be very sluggish at times. I would select a talk from the left pane and it would take more than a minute or two to load in the right pane. I also noticed it took very long to register my vote at times.	8/24/2015 1:53 PM

OpenStack Track Chair Survey (Tokyo Summit)

Q14 Is there anything else that you would like to share with the Foundation staff?

Answered: 12 Skipped: 17

#	Responses	Date
1	Great job on execution! It is not easy to manage a Call For Speakers process as large as the one you do for every OpenStack summit.	8/28/2015 9:21 AM
2	Thank you for putting together yet again another transparent, community influenced selection process.	8/26/2015 10:05 PM
3	How to select the track is important because track chair selects the proposals that match the theme of track. I think many submitter don't recognize the importance, so it would be better to more noticing it. And contrary, creating and naming the track is more important for the summit.	8/26/2015 9:26 AM
4	Just a huge thank for allowing me to be part of the process and contribute to the OpenStack community. It is an honor and pleasure.	8/25/2015 6:20 AM
5	I think Foundation staff is awesome!	8/24/2015 6:08 PM
6	Good job :)	8/24/2015 2:28 PM
7	Thanks for all the hard work on putting these events on. Love to be able to rate speakers and talks, that's my one big ask.	8/24/2015 2:26 PM
8	I mentioned in the mailing list that session feedback is something that I think would be extremely valuable in the future. I also don't know if it's worth considering sub-tracks for vendor-centric pitches. That way there's a balance between those that are OpenStack based talks and Vendor marketing talks. I'd also like to see us stop giving valuable stage time to some of the "old guard" who are extremely vocal in constantly saying "OpenStack is sooo hard, there's no way you can deploy it on your own, you need to hire my company or company-xzy". They aren't constructive and in a number of cases their information isn't even accurate or relevant any longer.	8/24/2015 2:16 PM
9	You guy are awesome, thanks for all your hard work! Looking forward to continuing to make OpenStack better, both communally and technically.	8/24/2015 2:12 PM
10	The Related OSS projects has now become the favourite destinaton both for projects that are independent from OpenStack but interact with it (e.g.: CloudFoundry) and for OpenStack project that do not have their own track (e.g.: Sahara, Heat). I think it was originally designed for the former class of project, and I'd like it to stay like this. I personally enjoy very much listening about things more or less loosely related to OpenStack is also a welcome break from the "OpenStack, OpenStack, OpenStack!" hammering we get there. Perhaps more tracks for Openstack projects can be added, especially considering their explosion in number with the adoption of the big tent model.	8/24/2015 2:05 PM
11	Thank you for providing excellent support and working with the community to make the Summit spectacular!	8/24/2015 2:01 PM
12	Great job Todd, Claire & Kendall! We couldn't do it without the amazing tool & email nagging!	8/24/2015 1:57 PM