TestFest Evaluations

1	**Box**	Which Enabler are you testing - Client or Server
2	**0-5**	Please rate the overall facilities of the test rooms provided at the Vodafone Lab
3a,b	**0-5**	Please rate the LAN /IT Infrastructure provided in the Test Rooms
5	**0-5**	Please rate the amount of effort needed to conect to the Operator Infrastructure
6	**0-5**	Please rate the support provided by the Host Operators' engineers at the event
7	**Text**	Do you have any General Comments about the Lab/Test Room facilities provided for the event? How could they be improved?
8	**0-5**	Please rate the level of coffee breaks provide for participants at the TestFest
9	**0-5**	Please rate the level of lunches provide for participants at the Holiday Inn
10	**0-5**	Please rate the quality of the on-line information provided for the TestFest
11	**0-5**	Please rate the ease of use of the on-line registration system for the TestFest
12	**0-5**	Please rate the quality information provided by email after the close of registration
13	**Text**	What improvements do you think OMA could make to the announcements and registration to improve the effectiveness of the TestFests?
14	**0-5**	Please rate the support provided by the OMA staff in the setup and running of the TestFest
15	**0-5**	Please rate the effectiveness of the results gathering managed by the Trusted Zone
16	**0-5**	Please rate the quality of the Hotels selected by OMA for the TestFest participants
17	**0-5**	Please rate the value for money of the hotels selected by OMA for the TestFest
18	**0-5**	Please rate the value of the social event held on Tuesday evening
19	**0-5**	Did using a Common IMS make testing harder or easier for your participation at the TestFest
20	**0-5**	Please rate the support provided by the Common IMS Systems' engineers at the event
21	**Text**	What is the single most important improvement that OMA should do to improve the usefulness of the TestFests for you and your Company
22	**0-5**	Please rate the overall benefit to you and your company of attending the TestFest
23	**0-5**	Please rate the overall organization of the TestFest
24	**Text**	Do you have any other comments on this TestFest or the OMA TestFest program in general

TestFest Evaluations

TestFest-7			**2.84**	**2.87**	**2.10**	**2.26**		**-**	**3.43**		**3.91**	**3.63**	**3.78**
TestFest-8			**3.21**	**2.36**	**3.07**	**3.94**		**3.80**	**3.88**		**3.07**	**3.41**	**3.96**
TestFest-9			**2.53**	**2.05**	**2.96**	**2.67**		**1.90**	**3.11**		**3.22**	**2.86**	**3.73**
TestFest-9.5			**3.29**	**3.84**	**2.43**	**3.94**	**4.63**	**3.97**	**4.00**	**3.45**	**3.67**	**3.07**	**3.63**

Question	**1a**	**1b**	**2**	**3a**	**3b**	**4a**	**4b**	**5**	**6**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**
			Facilities	**LAN/IT Wired**	**LAN/IT Wireless**	**Operator GPRS**	**Operator UMTS**	**Ease Of Connect**	**Operator Support**	**Catering (Coffee)**	**Catering (Lunch)**	**Online Info.**	**Online Reg.**
1	PoC	Client	4	1					3	0	3	1	4
2	PoC	Server	3	5	3	4		5	5	5	3	3	4
3	PoC	Client	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	2	4	4
4	PoC	Client	3	2	2	4		5	5	4	5	4	5
5	PoC	Server	3		4		5	5	4	3	3	4	1
6	PoC	Client		4	4	4		3	5	4	5	5	4
7	PoC	Server	2	5	0	4		0	5	5	5	2	1
8	PoC	Server	3	4	1			4	3	3	3	2	3
9	PoC	Client	4	5	2			5		4	4	2	3
10	PoC	Client	4		2	5		5	4	4	4	3	
11	PoC	Client	2		0	5		4	3	1	4	4	3
12	PoC	Client	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	2	2	4
13	XDM	Server	3	4	3			5	3	4	4	3	4
14	XDM	Server	3	4	0			4	4	5	5	2	5
15	XDM	Client	3	3	1			4	4	3	4	3	
16	XDM	Client	3	4	2			4		3	4	3	4
17	PoC	Client	3	5		4		5	5	3	4	4	5
18	XDM	Server	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	2	1	2	
19	XDM	Server	3	4	3			4		5	5	2	3
20	XDM	Server	3	3	0				3	4	4	4	4
21	XDM	Client	3	2	1	5	5	2	5	5	5	3	5
22	PoC	Client	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5
23	PRS	Server	4	4	3			4	4	3	4	4	
24	PRS	Server	2	2	2					3	3	3	3

TestFest Evaluations

TestFest-7			**2.84**	**2.87**	**2.10**	**2.26**		**-**	**3.43**		**3.91**	**3.63**	**3.78**
TestFest-8			**3.21**	**2.36**	**3.07**	**3.94**		**3.80**	**3.88**		**3.07**	**3.41**	**3.96**
TestFest-9			**2.53**	**2.05**	**2.96**	**2.67**		**1.90**	**3.11**		**3.22**	**2.86**	**3.73**
TestFest-9.5			**3.29**	**3.84**	**2.43**	**3.94**	**4.63**	**3.97**	**4.00**	**3.45**	**3.67**	**3.07**	**3.63**

Question	**1a**	**1b**	**2**	**3a**	**3b**	**4a**	**4b**	**5**	**6**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**
			Facilities	**LAN/IT Wired**	**LAN/IT Wireless**	**Operator GPRS**	**Operator UMTS**	**Ease Of Connect**	**Operator Support**	**Catering (Coffee)**	**Catering (Lunch)**	**Online Info.**	**Online Reg.**
25	PRS	Server	2	4	2				3	1	4	2	3
26	PRS	Server	4	4	2			4	4	3	5	4	4
27	PRS	Client	3	4				3	4	1	4	4	5
28	PoC	Client	3	4	4			4	4	4	3	5	4
29	PoC	Client	4	4	3	4			5	4	5	4	4
30	PoC	Server	5		5			5	5	5	5	4	5
31	PoC	Client	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	4	4
32	PoC	Server	3	4	4			3	2	2	3	2	2
33	PoC	Server	4	4		3		4	4	4	4		
34	XDM	Client	4	5				5	5	4	2	4	4
35	XDM	Server	3	3	0			4	3	3	3	2	
36	XDM	Server	3	4	2			2	3	4	4	4	
37	PRS	Client	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	3	5
38	PRS	Client	4	4	0	1		3	4	3	3	3	2
39	PoC	Client	3	4	3			4	4	3	4	3	5
40	PoC	Server	3	4	4			5	3	4	3	3	4
41	Poc	Server	4	4	1	1		5	4	3	3	1	1
42	PoC	Server	2	3	2			3	3	2	2	1	1

TestFest Evaluations

TestFest-7			**3.76**	**3.80**	**3.78**	**3.96**	**3.71**				**3.53**	**3.87**
TestFest-8			**3.83**	**4.12**	**3.90**	**3.50**	**2.63**				**3.50**	**3.85**
TestFest-9			**3.21**	**3.61**	**3.60**	**3.80**	**3.16**	**4.33**			**3.74**	**3.40**
TestFest-9.5			**3.56**	**3.80**	**3.50**	**3.53**	**3.24**	**3.18**	**2.00**	**3.23**	**3.77**	**3.70**
Question	**1a**	**1b**	**12**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**	**19**	**21**	**22**	**23**
			Email Info.	**OMA Staff**	**TZ Effective**	**Hotels Quality**	**Hotels Value**	**Social Event**	**Using Common IMS**	**IMS Support**	**Benefit to Co.**	**Overall Org.**
1	PoC	Client	2	4	1	4	4		3	4	3	3
2	PoC	Server	4	5	5	0	0	5	0	3	3	5
3	PoC	Client	3	4	4	1	1	4	0	1	4	4
4	PoC	Client	5	4	4	5	3	4	1	4	4	4
5	PoC	Server	3	3	4	4	3	4	1	2	4	4
6	PoC	Client	4	5		3	5	5	4	3	5	5
7	PoC	Server	2	5		4	4	5	0	1	5	3
8	PoC	Server	2	4	3	4	3	2	1	3	5	3
9	PoC	Client	3	2		5	4	3	3	3	1	2
10	PoC	Client	4	4	2	3	3	3	4	4	2	4
11	PoC	Client	4	3		1	1	1	4		3	4
12	PoC	Client	4	2	2	4	4	2	5	5	5	4
13	XDM	Server	3	5	3	4	2	3			3	4
14	XDM	Server	4	3		3	2	4			1	4
15	XDM	Client	3	3	3	4	4	4	2		4	4
16	XDM	Client	3	3		4	4	4			4	3
17	PoC	Client	4	4	4	4	2	2	0	3	3	3
18	XDM	Server	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	4	4	3
19	XDM	Server	3	4		3	4	3			4	3
20	XDM	Server	4	4		4	4	2			5	4
21	XDM	Client	3	4	3	5	5	5	3	3	5	4
22	PoC	Client	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	5	4
23	PRS	Server	4	4	3	4	4		0	3	2	3
24	PRS	Server				3	3	3	0	1	2	3

TestFest Evaluations

TestFest-7			**3.76**	**3.80**	**3.78**	**3.96**	**3.71**				**3.53**	**3.87**
TestFest-8			**3.83**	**4.12**	**3.90**	**3.50**	**2.63**				**3.50**	**3.85**
TestFest-9			**3.21**	**3.61**	**3.60**	**3.80**	**3.16**	**4.33**			**3.74**	**3.40**
TestFest-9.5			**3.56**	**3.80**	**3.50**	**3.53**	**3.24**	**3.18**	**2.00**	**3.23**	**3.77**	**3.70**
Question	**1a**	**1b**	**12**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**	**19**	**21**	**22**	**23**
			Email Info.	**OMA Staff**	**TZ Effective**	**Hotels Quality**	**Hotels Value**	**Social Event**	**Using Common IMS**	**IMS Support**	**Benefit to Co.**	**Overall Org.**
25	PRS	Server	3									
26	PRS	Server	4	4	3	4	4	3	2	2	4	4
27	PRS	Client	4	4	5	4	2	3	3	4	4	5
28	PoC	Client	5	4	4	3	3	4	0	4	5	4
29	PoC	Client	5	4	3	4	5	3	4	4	4	5
30	PoC	Server	4	5	5	3	4	2	5	5	5	5
31	PoC	Client	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
32	PoC	Server	2	3				2				3
33	PoC	Server		4				3	4	4	3	3
34	XDM	Client	4	3		3	2	3			4	4
35	XDM	Server		3	3			3				
36	XDM	Server		3		2	2	4			4	4
37	PRS	Client		4	5	5	5	5	1	3	5	3
38	PRS	Client		4	3	2	3	3	0	4	3	3
39	PoC	Client	4	4	3	4	3	2	2	3	4	4
40	PoC	Server	4	4	4	5	3	2	0	2	4	3
41	Poc	Server	3	4	4	5	4	2	0	3	4	4
42	PoC	Server	3	4	3	3	4	3	0	3	4	3

TestFest Evaluations

TestFest-9.5	Person Commenting	Comments Provided.

7. General Comments about Lab/Test Room

1	Have a better separation between test sessions to be used if a test session is suck by an enabler
2	No complaints - all fine!
3	WE used more time to setting up the VPN to our servers and to check the connectivity through the Firewall.
4	Space a little cramped - LAN bandwidth too little.
6	Little tight on space - "warm" and cosy
7	Have the XDM room closer to the PoC room
12	More tables and chairs are needed. Switching clients between servers should be more flexible.
13	Rooms are overcrowded
14	Not enough room. PoC and XDM rooms too far apart
18	Need Air-Conditioning on hot July days
22	Bigger Room and dedicated client team seats would be appreciated.
25	Handout the information needed, such as DNS Server etc.
29	Nice, could have had a little more room for laptops and cables when using handset h/w setup.
30	A little hot in the test room
31	Shortage of work space. Should define typical space and person for server team and client team.
33	Better Air Conditioning
38	Very stable power/network supply.
41	Wireless (WiFi) was not working needs improvement.

13. OMA Improvements to Registration

1	Inform ??? the enabler coming for the first time: how is defined a test session
2	A ??? Map of city
4	Will submit separate list…
5	Place direct link on TestFest Page
6	Clear Understanding of what Common IMS requires to work - How flexible?
10	Time and Taxi fares should be more accurately estimated.
13	Mention the number of clients and devices participating

TestFest Evaluations

TestFest-9.5	Person Commenting	Comments Provided.
	14	A TestFest web Site would save me from Scanning 100s of emails
	18	Information about Metro and Airpot Transportation
	29	Perhaps more adhoc testing
	30	Early publication of test cases to server teams.
	37	Provide Configuaration, time scheduler by email before the Testfest begins
	41	Possibly Multi-Language Support

21. Single Most Important Improvement

1	Provide all the time (when it is opened) an opened test session where enablers can be connected -> Avoid a waste of time
2	Announce participants in
4	1. More time, and 2. Pre-Testing time increase
5	Earlier Communication on Test Setup changes eg. Common IMS
7	More time
9	Don't put immature and mature systems in the same session, so that we do not have to wait all the time.
10	Pre-Test the IMS Core with the different PoC Servers more carefully, so that all PoC Servers know they can run through it.
12	More time for Testing Sessions. TestFests could last longer and have them only four time in the year.
13	Minimum quality of implementations
14	Ensure there is a tool against which pre-testing is possible to avoid lack of minimal quality in the participants implementations
15	A couple more days at front to do Ad-Hoc Debugging
16	Clients and Servers shuold have at least some basic functionality that works…..
18	Adhere closely to the early and mature implementation category
22	Organize pre-test sessions if possible
23	More consideration of testing with Common IMS. Most of our week was spent on this, not with clients.
25	Better Preparation when it comes to Common IMS.
26	Be stricter with the pre-testing and entry criteria - Level of maturity very spread.
29	Less paper, electronic results entry would be nice.
30	Client Implementations must be able to complete basic tests.

TestFest Evaluations

TestFest-9.5	Person Commenting	Comments Provided.
	31	Improvement of Test Tool for Enablers
	32	Would be nice if there is more free time in the schedule in addition to testing - week is too busy
	33	Somehow assign the tests so that mature clients are testing more together
	37	Generate the tests for one independent client.
	38	Need to test with Stable IMS
	41	More preparation on interworking common IMS for TestFest.
	42	Had much problems interworking basic SIP and SDP messges.

24. Other Comments

7	Combinations in Test Sessions limit the testing a lot.
10	One day off in the middle of the week to be able to fix major problems. Maybe then the testing after that can be improved.
16	Facilities were pretty good.
18	Early implementations should not be involved in the numbers game of the mature implementations.
22	All good, but maybe we should have more time to thik before filling in this report.
23	Preliminary testing or info transfer for IMS core needs to occur - more than a conf call the week before.
29	Perhaps a half day of testing/setup/connecting for client before Monday.
30	A classification between development teams and interoperability client teams.
31	I hope that many companies attend to OMA TestFest
33	We had too many totally unfinished participants attending.
38	I lost a lot of time because of IMS issues.
39	I think one client and one server in pretest will be better to show level of preparation of the participants.
41	Possibily providing client simulators for server side that ease the interoperabilityat TestFests

TestFest Evaluations

TestFest-9.5	Person Commenting	Comments Provided.
1. Proposed setup for Enabler Satisfactory?		
XDM	13	As XDM is a pure Client-Server protocol I would expect Pass criteria to take this into account. A more appropriate pass criteria would be the following: (1) UE1-XDMS, (2) UE2-XDMS, and (3) UE1-XDMS-UE2. Test Cases where only 1 client supports the functionality can be specified more accurately.
XDM	14	Yes
XDM	15	-
XDM	16	Yes
XDM	18	Yes
XDM	19	Yes
XDM	20	Yes
XDM	21	Yes
XDM	34	Yes
XDM	36	Yes
Presence	23	In Future it would be helpful if the IMS core could support multiple clients from the same IP (for testing purposes).
Presence	25	No, there was no information on the setup for presence before the TestFest.
Presence	26	Infrastructure OK - Client Maturity Not OK.
Presence	27	Yes
Presence	37	When one client had bugs which prevented him from trying further tests, the other could not continue either.
Presence	38	Yes
2. Was PoC Needed?		
XDM	13	No
XDM	14	No
XDM	15	Yes
XDM	16	No
XDM	18	Sometimes. No problems with connectivity between PoC and XDM systems
XDM	19	No

XDM	20	No
XDM	21	No
XDM	34	No
Presence	23	No
Presence	25	No
Presence	26	No
Presence	27	No
Presence	37	No
Presence	38	No

3. Was Presence needed for XDM Testing?
3. Was XDMS Needed for Presence Testing?

XDM	13	No
XDM	14	No
XDM	15	Yes, but we did not have time to get to that part.
XDM	16	No
XDM	18	Sometimes - see previous answer to Q2.
XDM	19	No
XDM	20	No
XDM	21	No
XDM	34	No
Presence	23	No - although we could have used another XDMS - but ran out of time.
Presence	25	Yes, Presence uses the XDMS enabler
Presence	26	Yes, so XDMS need to bee available
Presence	27	No
Presence	37	Yes, It was not configured in advance and it caused a delay.
Presence	38	Yes

4. More benefit to test XDM as part of PoC or Presence?

XDM	13	No
XDM	14	No

XDM	15	No, but only because TestFest is a bit early and it's to our benefit to test separately (simpler!)
XDM	16	Well…. No
XDM	18	No time for this testing in PoC Test.
XDM	19	No - because dependencies to other enablers will lead to more waiting time… But Yes, because the test cases will be more complex and realistic…
XDM	20	No
XDM	21	Not Sure
XDM	34	Partially. It is good splitted. Some of test from Poc Enabler should be moved to XDM ETS, such as M701, 702 and 704)

5. ETS Coverage of Enabler Sufficient

XDM	13	No, Problem Report Written
XDM	14	No. No PoC-XDM Tests for PoC Rules. No PoC XDMS - Shared XDM "interworking" testcases
XDM	15	Yes
XDM	16	At this point the cases were very basic and some were a bit unclear. For example, a URI attribute can be retrieved by GETTING the element and parsing it, OR by getting the attribute directly with an attribute selector. Test cases should be more precise.
XDM	18	PoC Authorizaton rules should be covered in XDM Testing
XDM	19	Encrpytion should also be tested.
XDM	20	Caching was not really covered. Neither was validation of additional constraints
XDM	21	More Client Client interop - like one client change display name of one contact then the next client change the display name of the same contact.
XDM	36	No, Conditional Request
Presence	23	RLS testing and SIP Profile testing need to be Examined / Added
Presence	25	Lots of RLS test cases for RLS, and the test cases for "user presence" should also be run for list presence subscriptions (RLS).
Presence	26	RLS ought to be covered better. The test spec needs more maturity.
Presence	27	Yes
Presence	37	Yes
Presence	38	No

6. Any General Comments on Testing Procedures and Pass Criteria of ETS

XDM	13	XDM is Client-Server
XDM	14	-

XDM	15	-
XDM	16	They should be more precise, because some tests could be passed with quite different approaches.
XDM	18	-
XDM	34	There should be pre-testing session just client-server before entering in test session (to avoid blocking points and to be able to test clients interoperability.
Presence	23	OK
Presence	25	Need to be more detailed, see PRs etc.
Presence	26	More details neeted
Presence	27	No
Presence	37	It was confusing that for all tests two clients from different companies were needed.
Presence	38	Could be more real time scenarios

7. General comments on Section 3 of ETS

XDM	13	Arranging a "Coding Fest" where different vendors can make first implementations is something useful This should not be mistaken with a "TestFest". Too many client implementations are using the TestFest to learn about the specification.
XDM	14	Policies: Split Test Cases to: (1) Client 1 vs Server 1, (2) Client 2 vs Server 1, and (3) Client 1 vs Server 1 vs Client 2.Then the test is only passed if both clients and server function correctly.
XDM	15	-
XDM	16	-
XDM	18	If I use the tests internally, do I still need two other companies
Presence	27	No
Presence	38	Not complete

8. General Comments on Section 5 of ETS

Presence	23	SIP Profile testcases and more RLS test cases.
Presence	27	No

9. Any other comments

XDM	16	It happened too often that the other client could not participate in the test sessions. The reasons appeared to be: (1) other clients application didn't work (at all or the functionality was very limited), or (2) the test engineer of the other client was somewhere else.

Presence	23	It is imperative to have pre-TestFest Interop Testing with the IMS Core
Presence	27	No
XDM	34	Specifications are not clear.
Presence	37	Support could be better and non accurate comments
Presence	38	Should use one stable IMS, otherwise time wastage is more

10. Client or Server

XDM	13	Server
XDM	14	Server
XDM	15	Both
XDM	16	Client
XDM	18	Server
XDM	19	Server
XDM	20	Server
XDM	21	Client
XDM	34	Client
XDM	36	Server
Presence	23	Server
Presence	25	Server
Presence	26	Server
Presence	27	Client
Presence	37	Client
Presence	38	Client