

PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING SERVICE ORIENTED ARCHITECTURE

SYDNEY, 15 – 16 MARCH 2005

Delegate Feedback

THE CHAIRPERSON – DAY ONE and DAY TWO

Dr Jim Webber <i>Timekeeping: 5.9</i>	• Did a good job of keeping to time and keeping us interested. • Signs good. Not intrusive.
---	--

DAY ONE - PRESENTATIONS

Dr Jim Webber <i>Pres: 5.5</i> <i>Content: 5.1</i>	• Interesting developer standpoint • Good style but bit too technical for me • Good overview but no case studies to ground assertions • I found this very interesting but the first presentation could have been an overview for SOA to bring everyone to the same level. • Very heavy content for the first presentation • Needed to slow down and define terms • To many acronyms • Always good to get a bit of tech stuff, but glad it didn't set the scene
Steve Crisp <i>Pres: 5.3</i> <i>Content: 5.2</i>	• To technical for me • Good case study and work in progress. • Very good use of real experiences, good pace. • Quite technical
Paul Lund <i>Pres: 5.7</i> <i>Content: 5.7</i>	• Interesting • Good insights and learnings • Very relevant • Honest study of IAG experience. Pity he didn't stay afterwards for further Q & A • Very interesting • Slide hardcopy would have been good • Slides not provided • No slides
Norm Lawler <i>Pres: 5.3</i> <i>Content: 5.3</i>	• Solid but not great insights • Good pace • The SOA content was light • Interesting case study
Paul Begley <i>Pres: 5.8</i> <i>Content: 5.3</i>	• Good topic and approach • Good content although a bit short • Too theory based. Wanted Rio Tinto experiences in planning/executing SOA • Clear, to the point and useful. Excellent • No slides
Sam Higgins <i>Pres: 6.0</i> <i>Content: 5.7</i>	• Good style • Reasonably engaging presenter, not sure about content • Good presentation. Would have come across better if he were in a morning slot. • Some very practical issues were covered in this presentation. Very useful • Very good. Like the practical side.

Clive Robertts Pres: 4.2 Content: 4.1	• Slide show didn't equal what was given in folder (pictures aside). • Very theoretical • Good start, but became a product pitch • Vendor theory/sell. Needs more case studies. • No content, just marketing • Good general overview, should have been the first presentation on Day 1 • Missing slides from hardcopies • Missing slides • Did not enjoy a product sales job
Chris Tham Pres: 5.2 Content: 5.5	• Knowledgeable, interesting • Too much time spent on theory, wanted more on NAB experiences • Interesting talk. Down to earth • Good reality check. Cut through all the hype and told it like it was • Very impressive lady

DAY TWO - PRESENTATIONS

Don Bartley Pres: 4.4 Content: 5.0	• Good useful information and approach • Good content, but could be delivered in a more engaging way • Diagrams presented were too crowded • Excellent content. Slides hard to navigate through usually • A lot of content here and covered very quickly, a bit disjointed – jumped around a lot • I found this very useful • Some good ideas, like poster idea and emphasis on communication to team • Hard copies of slides were not provided • No hardcopy • Quite interesting, should have had more focus on SOA • They've done some great work
Dr Hao He Pres: 5.1 Content: 5.0	• Interesting but got too low level for me • Demonstration lost me • Best talk so far • Very useful information • Needed to ground his presentation in a "real world" case study. Too academic in its focus and examples • Too detailed for me at the end but the first 40 minutes was excellent • Interesting topic but a little difficult to follow at times • The end was a little confusing • Good to see that it is still a debate rather than a foregone conclusion
Michael Hawkins Pres: 4.8 Content: 4.4	• Good talk but many unexplained assertions • Good presenter. Useful content. Managed to avoid product pitch • Did not appear to accept differing views very well • Good presentation style and pace. Makes key point about critical value of data but does not deliver on how to align data in/across organisations • Another case of vendor defined problem that they happened to have a solution to.
Patrick Gannon Pres: 5.2 Content: 5.1	• Interesting • Good insight – polished • Good overview, but it was like drinking from a fire hose • Valuable • Good but probably better placed in early sessions of Day 1 as a scene setter • Too many acronyms. Too much material. • Patrick seemed to have much to say but didn't have enough time and therefore had to skip slides • Useful update

David Peterson Pres: 5.7 Content: 5.7	• Very interesting. Shame about time and not finishing properly. Slides different to handout. • Big topic, skimmed across too much • Content was good, but timing was poor • Could have gone more quickly through first half. The skimmed bit was more interesting! • Interesting but could only really cover higher-level concepts in 45 minutes. • Content was not tailored to the purpose of this conference. Far too much detail, more appropriate for a security-focused conference • Useful for me because I knew of the detail
Dr Paddy Forde Pres: 4.3 Content: 4.0	• Found it a bit generic, academic. Slides were different to handout. • Topic too big, skimmed over information • Very academic. I couldn't see the relevance of most of what was covered. • Would have liked correct slides • Hard copies did not match presentation or slides were missing • A very intelligent and knowledgeable man but a bit academic for this kind of conference • I don't think he spoke to the topic or even his own overview most of the time
Greg McLeod Pres: 4.3 Content: 4.4	• Good story, very relevant. • Too high level. Needed to provide greater details on how Austrade did BPM in data and service patterns. • The green background is really hard to look at • Had potential but fell short on details • A presentation focused on BPM. Did not show how SOA contributed to the case study • Will be good to get the SOA Austrade slides • Good story
Peter Richardson Pres: 5.7 Content: 5.4	• Reasonably interesting • Very technical • Good examples

WORKSHOP A

Peter Stanski Pres: 4.4 Content: 2.8	• Presenter good, adapted but expecting a workshop. So not happy at all with this presentation • Very good once we abandoned the structure and became a workshop • Presenter was probably given incorrect scope of workshop. Did not stick to his slides and diverted more to everyone's concerns, experiences. Presenter adapted very well to audience requests • The description of this workshop did not match the content. I feel I have wasted a morning on this presentation, which does not add anything to the last two days • Very knowledgeable but content generally didn't help me. Peter tried to have some structure but it was too general and then we jumped around too much • Not at all on topic. No content of any value • Although interesting and importing a deal of valuable information, the presentation had little to do with the topic • Started badly, was too low. Finished better • Peter is obviously a very valuable resource but the structure was wrong
---	---

WORKSHOP B

Mark Booth Pres: 5.8 Content: 5.9	• Well-structured presentation. Informative • Knowledgeable, for me probably too low level but I guess you cannot target all levels • Very Interesting, but still not really a workshop • Very good presentation with technical learning. Extremely useful, concise and clear
--	--