


Evaluation Summary:



Continuous Delivery & DevOps Conference 2015, Oslo

How did you like the conference in general?



1	0	0%
2	1	1.7%
3	8	13.8%
4	37	63.8%
5	12	20.7%

Please elaborate your feed-back on the conference in general

One of the presenters felt like a sales pitch, Xethru. One star less due to that. Other than that, very happy. Good mix of speakers.

Very interesting speakers and ideas. Next time I would like to see more practical examples or best practises in a "field". A few workshops would be nice. I do understand that there is no solution which can work for all, but maybe just use some "popular"

things such as aws, jenkins, chef/puppet/ansible/cfengine and git working together.

The opening keynote was not very useful. And it was weird to have two long breaks in the afternoon agenda - rather make the conference a bit shorter.

A bit much vendor focus, but also a couple of really great talks.

Next time I like to see more from the operation view

Great talks, good partners and exhibits, great location, well-timed power-outage. Plenty of time to network with people. Some talks a bit rushed at the end, might help to have better time-keeping support in the room so that there is also time for Q&A.

The conference was definitely interesting, and I particularly found the software presented by sponsors at the booths interesting. The final keynote was also great. I do think that some of the presentations could benefit from being longer, but realize how this could be difficult for a one day conference.

Well organized, no hiccups, good talks and mingling between the talks.

Well organized with a lot of interesting sessions.

Great content. Very focused.

I was expecting more hands on sessions with demos and the like. Conceptual overviews of concepts I was very aware of weren't that useful. Talks on CoDe (see what I did there?) tools or combinations of tools with demos is what I'd be looking for.

Most of the material was known to me already. I expected learning more.

Nice to meet people and I got some new arguments for introducing DevOps/Continuous Delivery. However I have learnt little new. More technical "how we do it" talks would be good though some talks focused on changing the culture are useful too. Tip: It was difficult to choose between talks as their descriptions were too short to be really useful. The descriptions should focus more on not just what the talk is about but also who and why should attend; what will it give me?

It was nice. I re-visited few ideas. Some ideas got re-validated by the speakers. The best, I learned few new things. I had good discussions with some speakers and some of the Pragma team members. It was great!

Great organization of event, delicious food, good speakers, interesting sponsors and nice city :)

Important topic, good people, good speakers. Personally, I think I need a crash-course in how to go about changing organizations from the inside; I already know the tools, the benefits, and the pitfalls, but I don't know how to get my colleagues to pull in the same direction.

Very nice venue, but I think some of the talks held were a bit too similar.

The talks were ok, except the first keynote. Way too abstract. As a developer I prefer the concrete to the too-abstract. However, all in all a very well organized conference, with a

romantic candle light twist at the end.

Several of the talks did not give me much. Some were good though. I especially liked Olve, Novelda and the final keynote.

I really like the social events at the pre-conference meet up and tonight at Bristol hotel. To do the conference better I like the presentations to go more into details and maybe have some hands on. Furthermore, the breaks were too short because the networking part is for me very important.

It is always motivating and inspiring to listen to all speakers. Of course the networking is one of the most important parts.

Great! Only wish there were videos available of the talks. Always nice to do a recap and watch the ones you could not attend.

Interesting speakers. I found it hard to pick sessions based on the short summaries provided, so I relied on friends who had heard the speakers before and/or random choice.

It is always interesting to meet people who do the same thing for a living as I do. One thing I would like to have in the next conference would be a talk on version control systems and branching strategies.

A bit quirky.

It's always inspiring and motivating for continue with our daily challenges.

Good venue; tech worked fine; good food; good sessions.

All good, but it should be way more advanced technically. Hard topics, new things. I learned way too little during a day, but I ate well. So no complaints.

A bit too much "preaching to the choir"

Most was known, so that's why it didn't get a 5.

Very well organized. Good talks. The length of the talks was just right. I would have preferred more "how" and less "why." All in all I liked it a lot.

Like to learn how others are doing DevOps transformation and use the concept of Continuous Development

One or two talks were not a bit uninspiring. The last common talk was great. Some talks had a bit much hidden product sales. Extremely good lunch.


+: Good to have local speakers, appropriate amount of talks vs attendees, really nice venue, a delightful lunch. -: some talks were really about common knowledge (why devops is needed? maybe wrong audience?). Some talks felt like they were marketing companies and services.

I thought the conference was really interesting and valuable. For future conferences, maybe you could add some more technical stuff - examples of current tools or such.

Conferences are mainly about "confer"ing, right? I met a good number of interesting

people and had some good conversations and made some good contacts. The quality of the talks was variable and spanned the range from poor to very good. The least good talks were those from, no so well disguised tool-vendors.

General impression of the venue - Hotel Bristol



1	0	0%
2	0	0%
3	3	5.2%
4	26	44.8%
5	29	50%

Please elaborate your feedback

Nice to be in an old style hotel, as oppose to Mariott in Copenhagen. Only ovne thing that went bad, was light went out.

Nice place.

Fantastic lunch. Very comfortable seating. Okay coffee. Good air quality and temperature. Central location.

Poor sound quality, good food.

Maybe a bit crowded in the expo area.

Good food, lighting wasn't optimal. Power outage.

Very good venue for the size. Excellent food. A bit more coffee (borrow some espresso machines)

The venue was great, really classy. Awesome food. Only minuses was lack of coffee and the power outage.

Very nice. Needed more coffee and perhaps lights, although that was cozy.

It was ok, great food!

Great lunch. Good venue in general. Too bad about the power outage, but not much to do about that! :) Some of the water glasses in track 1 tasted heavily of soap.

Nice and even problem with the electricity in the end was more like positive and koselig (norwegian). I would probably add power sockets next time, so everyone can charge their laptops (could be that this would be a distraction factor, I don't have much experience how this influence people attention)

Nice, clean, helpful staff.

Deducting a point for losing power for the last 15 minutes. It would have been two points, but the candles were a nice touch :)

The Hotel Bristol is a nice, classic hotel. A more modern hotel might be more fitting. The food was good. I would have liked there to be coffee available during the track swaps, but this was not a major issue. The power outage during the Q&A session was unfortunate, but at least it didn't happen during one of the presentations.

The lunch blew my mind! Best ever! Nice size, and good service.

Delicious food and drinks, great rooms with tables!

Hotel Bristol was a perfect venue for a conference of this size.

Great place, nothing to add. Moving wall is impressive

Very good location, professional service, great lunch. After-conference bar was a bit chaotic and f*ing expensive, even for Oslo standards. Having a sponsor for that might also keep more people at the conference until the end (felt that the room was much emptier for Jan Bosch than it was in the morning keynote).

Very nice place, with lovely warm atmosphere. Rooms worked nice, both as one big one, and two separate rooms, with nearly no noise-pollution between the rooms. Booth area was a little cramped, but on the other hand, it kept people "together" and talking, and within earshot. Made it easier to get people into the track-rooms on time. Hotel staff were friendly and helpful. Lunch buffet was gorgeous. (More than made up for the rather disappointing breakfast)

Old very elegant hotel in the centre of Oslo. Everything just super.

The venue was a good size for this conference, easy to get too, and had some character. The banquet lunch was impressive! Although the power-outage was unfortunate, I think the hotel and the conference organisers handled it very well.

Very good hotel for the event

Food was great. Mingle area (exhibitors) cramped. Power outage I assume was random bad luck.

Good venue, but there were to little coffee

There could have been better supply of coffee during the breaks.

Comfortable seating and good catering. A bit more space in the exhibit area would have been nice.

Rooms quit ok, even it 's expansiv. WLAN has problems if you are placed in the corner of the house.

Perfect Hotel for such a conference. Perfect food etc. Only the space outside the conference room could be a bit bigger.

Perfect venue, also after the light went at the end of the conference :)

Excellent food, excellent technical setup. Easy to hear and see presenters. Wifi worked

well. Too few power outlets, though.

It's a nice hotel. Lunch was great.

Nice location. Very central. Sucky to have the power go out at the end.


Lovely and swanky. Great food. Great location. Deduction for the coffee-scandal :)

Rooms are ok, but wlan is very weak if you are in corner of the house.


It was great! I can't complaint.

The exhibit area was a bit too small. More focus on areas to mingle would be nice. And well, lights is nice. ;)

Georg von Sperling - Automation – a DevOps critical success factor
[Conference keynotes]



Jan Bosch - Using Continuous Delivery to Build Products Customers Actually Use
[Conference keynotes]



Please elaborate your feed-back on the two conference keynotes

The opening keynote was useless.

Georg von Sperling was not very exciting to listen to. Jan Bosch always spread out alot of energy and give some very good takeaways.

Interesting but a bit too long for my attention span.

First one was just not that inspiring, and a bit too slow paced to get people going in the morning. I never really caught "the message" if there was one. Closing keynote was the exact opposite, energy-wise, with good anecdotes and numbers to back them up. (but for those lucky enough to have been at the Copenhagen conf. it was mostly a repeat.)

They were good. That is all I can say.

First ok, but nothing new or inspiring. Second very good and entertaining.

These two had opposite problems; I felt like von Sperling's keynote needed a faster pace, while Bosch could have used an extra half hour (I'm sure he could have used more...) and felt quite rushed.

First keynote was a bit long, maybe it felt like that because of a lot of numbers, but I support C.A.L.M.S and business impact of the automation. Second keynote was a huge success, I would really want to see more facts and use cases how they applied HYPEX and QCD in other companies with the traditional operations.

Too little time for them to go through it all. I could easily listen to them for an hour each. Give them 10-15 minutes extra.

Nothing substantial new to me in first keynote, Jan Bosch always a pleasure to listen to, also the second time.

I did not "feel" the CA talk.. Jans talk was engaging.

Jan Bosch was awesome.

The talk from von Sperling was too abstract for me. I do like a mix of abstract and tangible stuff. Jan Bosch was an excellent speaker, and his customer focus to the talk was very interesting.

First keynote should be a motivational talk, but it wasn't. The last keynote was very inspiring!

The final Keynote speaker needs more time to give the full presentation but still managed to get crowd listening

von Sperling's keynote was a good start to the conference, but falls short when compared to Bosch's presentation. Bosch has a great presence on stage, and content-wise I think they were both very good. The only thing that wasn't great about Bosch's presentation was that he had to skip parts because he was running out of time.

The final keynote was great. I would like two days of just digging deeper into this!

I knew many of these things already. Maybe the speakers could have had 5 more minutes to talk.

Sperling was a bit high level for me. I would have liked more real world examples.

The first one was good but nothing really new or inspiring. Opposite the last one. Good entertainment ;-)

von Sperling's talk felt just a touch unfocused, otherwise great. Bosch needs to give more, and longer, talks in Oslo :)

Good but little new.

Not too engaging...

Georg had some good points, and was interesting enough. Jan had great presenter skills and kept us focused, delivered interesting material and food for thought. I loved it! Would like to hear more.

von Sperling keynote came off as trying to market CA tools, because companies have to know that CD is the buzzword nowadays. Didn't like that. Bosch keynote was fascinating. I didn't know about this research on software engineering and come out very interested.

The last one was very interesting and it was a pity we did not get more time to learn about the models presented towards the end.


Learned very little new from the first one.

Jan is good as usual, almost fall a sleep during the first one

The opening keynote was insufficiently energetic and didn't do what keynotes should do, which is set the tone and theme of the conference.


Learned just about nothing from Georg von Sperling. Jan Bosch had a interesting, info packed keynote.

Did you follow our the conference tweets?




Yes	18	31%
No	40	69%


Olve Maudal - Feedback-driven Product Development [Track sessions]




Austin Bingham - Making the case for review [Track sessions]




Per Arnold Blaasmo - From snapshot to release [Track sessions]




Mike Long - All unicorns were once horses [Track sessions]




Maarten Kennis, Continuous Delivery, it's not just about the tools [Track sessions]




Stein Inge Morisbak - DevOps or die! [Track sessions]




Bertrand Besnard - DevOps success key factors [Track sessions]




Dag Arne Brænd - Operational Excellence in Multi-disciplinary Product Development [Track sessions]




Ivar Østhus - Unleash your features gradually [Track sessions]




Lars Kruse - NoOps - beyond the DevOps frontier! [Track sessions]



Seb Rose - Estimates & Continuous Delivery [Track sessions]



Pardeep Sandhu - Continuous Delivery with Petrel - Large scale distributed application development [Track sessions]



How did the content of the presentations match your expectations in general?

Pretty good. Some of them were a bit overlapping perhaps, but I guess that is expected.
As I said previously, I feel a CoDe/DevOps conference needs more technical stuff with demos.

Most talks matched my expectations reasonably well based on the abstracts. I was expecting a bit more technical insights over presentations on agile methodologies. As I'm new to dev ops (and the industry in general), it feels a bit like continuous delivery is a renaming of agile to move the focus to what's important in agile, as a result of practices in the industry where agile isn't used as intended.

Need more from operation view

Content was good. It's good to see how other people are solving the same problems. I might hope for some more details and maybe demos next time.

Would be nice with some more technical talks too. But really depends on target audience and conference size...

In general, for me, the speaks were a bit on the high-level side. A bit too much "Why", a bit too much "anecdotal 'evidence' suggests" and it ends up feeling a bit "preaching to the enlightened". I would like a bit more "How". Tales from the trenches, both at the higher level, and preferably also some more technical talks.

More than meeting my expectations

I would like the presentations to go more into details

Worth my time

A bit high level but perhaps I was on the wrong track all the time :)

I knew too much, so maybe I had too high expectations.

Some were too introductory (we expected that a conference specialized on continuous delivery would assume some basic level). Some were also selling their solutions too hard. Didn't follow TED-commandments. But overall happy with the presentations.

I expected more advanced technical content.

A bit too much general stuff, people talking about what they read in a book or what other large companies does. I would like more real life experiences and challenges. We are not all google or amazon.

Good presentations focusing on the relevant story

I was pleasantly surprised. I wasn't really sure what to expect.

In general I am happy with the presentations. With the exception of Olves presentation, I think the sessions got more and more interesting.

The presentations met my expectations. It would have been fun to see more real-life product experience (like the Petrel one).

The only thing I really missed was something around the _how_ of culture-work.

Content was too basic in most of the presentations. I had expected more advanced

lessons.

it was inspirational, although i would have liked to have a talk about branching strategies and source control systems.

A bit too much focus on the basics and tools.

Learned very little, because most of things were well known from before

An ok spread of talks. The only thing I miss is the more tooling focus to the talks.

Perhaps this is not that kind of conference.

Mostly good or excellent. Luckily, No "sales show" this time.

Inspiring for myself as a non-technical decision maker being relatively new to the subject

In general presentations were good, but some of them were discussing known topics. It looked like some presenters just read some books and were retelling them, but not sharing their own experience.

There were too many presentations that seemed to be commercials for the sponsoring companies. Sorry guys, we know why a conference is organized, but it was just not so useful I believe, because the audience was clearly informed about devops and continuous delivery.

I thought it was a bit too many presentations about why CoDe and DevOps was a good thing (once you are there) and too little on practical issues/tools/techniques on how to actually get there. I did not learn as many new things as I had expected.

It matched well, but I'd like to learn more details on planning, structuring structuring, implementing and maintaining large sets of automated test suites. Also strategies for testing API contracts in a highly distributed architecture.

The presentations was OK

There could be more technical presentations - eg how difficult CoDe cases are implemented. Only Olve and Pardeep had technically oriented sessions (of what I went to). A little too much of talks like 'CoDe is the way forward, because bla bla bla', but not so much concrete solutions to challenges. Probably because DevOps and CoDe is still new field to many people/organizations. I didn't leave with anything concrete I had to go home and test/implement. Having said that, I still had a great day with many good and entertaining speakers, and my overall impression of the conference is positive!

Very good presentations very useful

Would have liked more experience reports. Maybe a bit too many "speech to the choir"-talks.

A bit too google-grap in some slides Novelda too Munch sales

I had hoped to get some more concrete advice from some of them. Too many were general advice that could as well have been presented at an agile conference ten years ago.

Too little new stuff, not practical/technical enough. I did not learn anything I could start using, aside of few tips and tools for feature toggles.

It was good, but I would have preferred more *how* and less "why."

It matched pretty well.

Most of them met my expectations. It is hard to speak in front of the audience esp in first time.

How did you find the ratio between local and foreign speakers?

I am not an expert on knowing who is local or foreigner. But I believe that was a good mix.

Perfect

it was ok

Ratio was fine.

ok

Fine as all speakers were fluently in English

Great with local speakers.

Good

Perfectly fine.

OK

Just fine

Ok. It is more important that the speakers have something to say, as where they are coming from.

No opinion, did not think about it.

Good balance

For me they all are foreign speakers :) No difference between them :)

Perfect.

Decent

Ok.

Good ratio.

Well balanced (i.e. I don't give a hoot where speakers are from - it is the quality and content that matters.) On the other hand, it might be worth it to actively work a little on the gender balance.

The mix of speakers was perfect.

Good balance.

It was good.

The mixture was good. It was nice to hear from local experience, but definitely useful to get a wider international input.

Good.

Good.

Fair.

I don't care if speaker local or foreign if he/she is talking about interesting things. So no issue here.

Fine. Does not matter as long as content is good

perfect

Very good.

It was as expected, no problems here.

Excellent!

great.

Very good as it was; lots of relevant case studies from local companies, and a fair amount of international speakers. I don't think there's a need to get more "devops celebrities" into the room, although it might attract a larger audience.

Good mix


It's ok, because everyone had to give something as input.

Ok, but when you have foreign speakers they should be top notch. If not use local talent.

I don't care where people come from as long as they're interesting (and speak a language I understand).

It was a good mix of local / foreign speakers

Panel discussion



1	2	3.4%
2	4	6.9%
3	26	44.8%
4	21	36.2%
5	5	8.6%

Panel discussion

The panel discussion was too short, and the power cut made it a little difficult to follow who was speaking.

More debates between the panel members would be nice. Now it was more a QA session. Maybe have a moderator arranging it and asking the questions?

Apart from the technical challenge with the power-cut, which was handled without a glitch, I think the panel discussion lacked some Zing. It all seemed very high level and abstract and a bit boring to be honest. It might work better with a more active facilitator. Apart from optionally repeating questions asked, if they are not quite clear, the facilitator might direct some of the questions, and ideally fill in (provocative?) follow up questions. Maybe a smaller, more focused panel, might also work better?

The panel discussion really needs a facilitator to get the panelists stoked up, keep the audience engaged and just to chair the discussion so everyone gets a say.

I think it would have been better if it had been an actual panel discussion than a Q&A session where just a few people answered. I had to leave after a while due to other reasons.

The discussions was pretty good, but I'd like to see the speakers discuss issues more actively between them. It don't think putting them up on the stage that way necessarily facilitates that. I don't know how, but maybe try something different. :)

The panel discussion was a good elaboration on what had been covered during the presentations. Although it didn't bother me much, it was unfortunate that the power was lost. Still I had no issues hearing the presenters on the panel, nor most of the people in the audience who asked questions.

Moderator was missing.

Yes. It was useful

Had to leave for reasons unrelated.

It was "unusual" to that the person that pretended to be the panel chair (Lars) often grabbed the microphone himself to give elaborated answers instead of giving it to one of the panelists - even when some of them expressed a wish to reply.

It wouldn't have been the same without Jan.

The power outage just killed the thing.

The "panel" was a success in the sense that it was an interesting extension of Jans keynote. But as a panel discussion it failed. Perhaps it would have worked better if it had a specific topic that the presenters could be prepared for.

To little time, but with light and power on the mikes, it would be great to have an additional day for workshops/hands-on

NA - Had to leave

No lights! I think a fish-bowl or open space would be a better discussion format

Success factor of a panel discussion is all about the questions. The questions were pretty good, and all audience based.

Nice final

Not really a discussion, more of a Q&A session. Still useful.

Next time would be good to have a discussion facilitator to keep hot

Nice and interesting, maybe a bit too theoretical.

a bit dull and I felt a bit sorry for those guys standing up there.

Hmm, Jan Bosch probably was hijacking the panel. Perhaps a topic for a panel discussion would be great in addition to Q & A.

I lost interest, left after 10 minutes

I left earlier since the content of the conference was more high level conceptual than i expected.

I left after the power outage because I was on call, and we had some issues!


Ok despite the technical challenges.

Discussion was useful.

Panel discussions IMO need to have a focus, otherwise it's just a sparse Q&A session. I don't like panels in general anyway, so I hope conferences get rid of them.

Nice. Even with the "romantic" idea with the candles. ;-)

Selling from stage



Fine - No problem	46	79.3%
Still too much "selling from stage"	12	20.7%

Please elaborate your feedback

Xethru tried too hard to sell, other people I talked to said the same about Xephia Labs

They tried to advertise their stuff very politely, as a last slide - I see no issue in that.

I didn't notice much selling at all. I appreciate the focus on this.

It was close to be acceptable, but still a bit too much selling from stage. However: "we are hiring" slides/messages are always problematic - companies that let good developers spend a day out of office to learn new stuff don't like to learn that it was more like a "career faire". Speakers that present their services are not so problematic.

This time no sales show.

Some of the talks were clear product pitches e.g. (Maarten Kennis) Other talks featured products (e.g. the wideband radar folks) but they clearly weren't trying to sell us radars, they were just context for an excellent presentation on continuous delivery.

There was a little selling from stage, but nothing too tacky. All in the best possible taste. Although a couple of talks did have a slight focus on products, I don't think any of the speakers were particularly focused on selling products. I think products could very well have received more focused, but the stands worked quite well.

The only downside is that the speakers that do spend 20 seconds "selling" things like books or conferences that they are not involved in, spend more time than that excusing and explaining why "it is ok in this special case". If you want to spend time "marketing" a conf. or something, don't also waste meta-time apologizing.

Ok

Enough company and product presentations to get context, but no selling.

The tool vendors talked about topics that always led to their solution. Generally not too bad though.

Selling from stage is not a problem, as we all have a business to run.

"DevOps isn't about tools, but here are 10 screenshots of our tools"

There was one talk that was supposed to be about devops being more than just tools.

The talk was largely about tools, and the speaker tried to sell his tools at the end.

The one which talked about not just tools was actually promoting his stuff :) but it is fine

Most of them did well but Maarten Kennis, Continuous Delivery, it's not just about the tools was a bit border line.

Nothing special.

They didn't "sell", but people get the vibe anyway. I think it wasn't too blatant, but still we don't mind *good* content if there's a conflict of interest. What should happen is that the presentation manages to engage with enough technical hands-on content.

Sponsor exhibition

Appdynamics has nice girls at least. Good, yeah.

Could not care less about that part

they where nice people to talk to.

Good variations

Didn't come for the sponsors, but it was a good atmosphere in the area.

Sponsor exhibition were great and interesting. You have great sponsors!

Most useful and informative

I didn't really engage with this at all.

NA

Fine, as we got to meet up with the sponsors, if we wanted to on our own

Had some nice interactions with the vendors.

OK

As expected.

The sponsors - except for maybe Pragma - did not have products relevant to my company/line of business.

I was actually quite impressed with the exhibition, but there was way too little room!

They were alright. I still have to read the book from XebiaLabs.

Ok

For me this was the least interesting parts. Probably because I really couldn't relate to any of the products , perhaps except for Pragma.

The 50.000kr value "competition" from CA was a bit of a scam but the exhibitions were fine.

So-so. Missing some Zing, and a bit more tech. For my taste, there was too heavy on the "expensive enterprise" and "devops tools" and too light on "CD" and "tools in a price range that make them relevant 'today' that you can actually pay for" (yes, I know, free/OS tools don't tend to sponsor booths :-). Again, as a hands on "tech" guy, I ran out of things to talk to the vendors about. Maybe having e.g. one booth available for a user group or OS project

Too little time for the exhibition.

I did not attend due to work emergency, sadly.

Na.

I was surprised that main devops drivers - chef, puppet, ansible, cfengine were not there. The appdynamics and xebialabs looked interesting. CA was too enterprise-ish.


I was very interested in seeing what products were available that could help in deployment automation, so I found the exhibition very useful. I found it nice that you managed to get a varied sponsorship, with mostly complementary products rather than competing products.

Didn't really expect anything.

I wasn't interested, so I have nothing to say.

fine

Would you consider attending next year?



Yes - for sure	50	87.7%
No - sorry	7	12.3%

Number of daily responses

