

M2M Standards as Growth Enablers Georgia Tech Research Institute, September 2011



Results Overview

Date: 9/30/2011 8:24 AM PST
Responses: Completes | Partial
Filter: No filter applied

1. The content of the conference was useful to me...

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|----|-----|
| Strongly disagree | | 3 | 5% |
| Disagree | | 0 | 0% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | | 1 | 2% |
| Agree | | 29 | 53% |
| Strongly agree | | 22 | 40% |

2. This conference provided me with new ideas...

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|----|-----|
| Strongly disagree | | 2 | 4% |
| Disagree | | 0 | 0% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | | 2 | 4% |
| Agree | | 35 | 64% |
| Strongly agree | | 16 | 29% |

3. How would you rate the meeting location?




| | | | |
|--------------------|--|----|------|
| 1 Poor | | 0 | 0% |
| 2 Fair | | 1 | 2% |
| 3 Good | | 17 | 31% |
| 4 Excellent | | 37 | 67% |
| Total | | 55 | 100% |

4. How would you rate the facilities?



| | | | |
|---------------|--|----|-----|
| 1 Poor | | 0 | 0% |
| 2 Fair | | 0 | 0% |
| 3 Good | | 10 | 18% |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|----|------|
| 4 Excellent |  | 45 | 82% |
| Total | | 55 | 100% |



5. How would you rate the visual aids?

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|----|------|
| 1 Poor | | 0 | 0% |
| 2 Fair |  | 1 | 2% |
| 3 Good |  | 14 | 25% |
| 4 Excellent |  | 40 | 73% |
| Total | | 55 | 100% |



6. How would you rate the staff?

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|----|------|
| 1 Poor | | 0 | 0% |
| 2 Fair | | 0 | 0% |
| 3 Good |  | 11 | 20% |
| 4 Excellent |  | 44 | 80% |
| Total | | 55 | 100% |

9. Would you be interested in learning more about participating in TIA's engineering committees or TIA membership?

| | | | |
|-------|---|----|------|
| Yes |  | 17 | 44% |
| No |  | 22 | 56% |
| Total | | 39 | 100% |

11. May we use your comments as a testimonial?

| | | | |
|-------|---|----|------|
| Yes |  | 23 | 79% |
| No |  | 6 | 21% |
| Total | | 29 | 100% |

M2M Standards as Growth Enablers

Georgia Tech Research Institute,

September 2011

Results Overview



Date: 9/30/2011 8:25 AM PST
 Responses: Completes | Partial
 Filter: No filter applied

| 7. Describe the most effective aspect(s) of this conference | |
|---|---|
| # | Response |
| 1 | The content was very good |
| 2 | good level of interaction with panelists. excellent balance of M2M topics of discussion |
| 3 | Diverse content with common thread concerns and objectives |
| 4 | cross section view that illustrates the needs are so similar across several verticals |
| 5 | variety of m2m applications and related standards |
| 6 | transport/logistics scada/dcs |
| 7 | great topics lots of material covered. well organized |
| 8 | Gathering of a wide range of industries involved in m2m |
| 9 | diversity of audience |
| 10 | lots of commonality among articles |
| 11 | was good to see the complexities discussed first by vertical markets (print solutions) before the round table tomorrow. you need to see the problems before you can fix them. |
| 12 | good vertical view of m2m. ITS view is good |
| 13 | examination of verticals was quite useful |
| 14 | the networking with non-TIA members who are knowledgeable |
| 15 | the line up and the diversified topics. "an eye opener for m2m vertical applications." |
| 16 | good representation of several industries. great tables with power |
| 17 | talks on the healthcare industries, automation, and transportation |
| 18 | discussion of standards gaps, or need for such at all. hard topic to cover by sector, so no harm/ no foul |
| 19 | good format |
| 20 | the topics and speakers were well prepared and excellent. to bad everyone is limited on time |
| 21 | covered a wide variety of usages |
| 22 | speaker presentations were informative. very well organized and great vertical diversity |
| 23 | wide variety of industries |
| 24 | get m2m related information from a wide range of industries in one day. |
| 25 | verticals rather than one domain |
| 26 | structure all in one room focus good verticals |
| 27 | sessions on transport, home automation, health care and payments and energy smart grid |
| 28 | wide range of industries |
| 29 | provided comprehensive view of m2m functions in multiple industries |
| 30 | All great well done |
| 31 | broad perspective of the different m2m markets. good pace of presentations good knowledgeable speakers |

| | |
|----|--|
| 32 | visibly into all the verticles represented |
| 33 | inter industry communications and new services among them |
| 34 | high quality promotions from a diverse sort of industries |
| 35 | the views of multiple different industries and their views of m2m gave great insight into the future of technology |
| 36 | industry experts describing the challenges at their specific vertical |
| 37 | the presenters all did a rea5t job in preventing the content thoroughly and effectively. great mix of topic areas |
| 38 | the depth of experience and expertise of the speakers combined with great presentation decks |
| 39 | Facility and media |
| 40 | organization |
| 41 | Brought together people from many organizations, lots of good discussions |
| 42 | excellent exposure to multiple vertical use cases- "opened many eyes to the broader m2m world" |

[Products & Services](#) | [About Us](#) | [Support/Help](#)

© 2011 Copyright MarketTools Inc. All Rights Reserved. | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms Of Use](#)

M2M Standards as Growth Enablers Georgia Tech Research Institute, September 2011



Results Overview

Date: 9/30/2011 8:25 AM PST
Responses: Completes | Partial
Filter: No filter applied

| 8. Describe the least effective aspect(s) of this conference | |
|--|---|
| # | Response |
| 1 | very busy slides of few speakers |
| 2 | great job of framing the problem and unifying the need for a standard but lacked discussion on what the solution looks like |
| 3 | perhaps it needs the participation of researchers from universities who are involved in m2m applications |
| 4 | atm/pos |
| 5 | industries views on the need for m2m standards collaboration |
| 6 | presentations, networking and interactions |
| 7 | would like to have heard/seen more. time is the only negative. this was an excellent use of my time |
| 8 | lack of vertical participation electricity, healthcare... |
| 9 | nothing specific |
| 10 | need hot tea, not just coffee |
| 11 | too far from west coast. need more time for questions |
| 12 | talk on mobile payment |
| 13 | many speakers were rushed |
| 14 | Dr. Thierry Lestable's presentation was very rushed and at times hard to understand |
| 15 | more time for Q and A and less presentation time |
| 16 | not many active students participating |
| 17 | no time for discussions with panelists |
| 18 | no convergence in every area and topics. how they can be integrated to one kind of m2m standard |
| 19 | manufacturing |
| 20 | some presentation were not on topic |
| 21 | technical level was good for me, but some technical folks would have like more technical content |
| 22 | maybe reduce the speakers background slides to allow more focus on the topic issues-questions |
| 23 | left the first day without a sense of accomplishment |
| 24 | I would have enjoyed just a little more information on what standards TIA is working on. |
| 25 | registration was a little confusing. i would recommend offering a confirmation calendar appt. |
| 26 | start and finish times coincide with rush hour |
| 27 | some presentations were too much of a "sales pitch" |
| 28 | always a balance between content. networking time/ no student present?? was it open?? |