OSLC 2012 Community Survey

1. Considering software tools, what's your organization's primary role?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Tool provider (e.g. software vendor)		**54.2%**	**58**
Tool integrator (e.g. consultant)		21.5%	23
Tool user (e.g. non-software industry)		24.3%	26
		answered question	107
		skipped question	1

2. When did you first hear about OSLC?

		Response Percent	Response Count
2008		20.6%	22
2009		18.7%	20
2010		**28.0%**	**30**
2011		21.5%	23
2012		11.2%	12
		answered question	107
		skipped question	1

3. How have you heard/learnt about OSLC?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Article/White Paper		15.9%	17
Business Partner		10.3%	11
Colleague		41.1%	44
IBM Rational Innovate		33.6%	36
jazz.net		**43.9%**	**47**
open-services.net		31.8%	34
Other Conference		1.9%	2
YouTube		6.5%	7
Facebook/LinkedIn/Twitter		4.7%	5
Webcast		4.7%	5
Industry Consortium		2.8%	3
I can't remember		3.7%	4
Other (please specify)		14.0%	15
	answered question		**107**
	skipped question		**1**

4. Based on your understanding of OSLC, to what degree do you agree with the following statements?

	1 - not at all	2	3 - somewhat	4	5 - completely	N/A or Don't know	Rating Average	Response Count
OSLC specifications are completely free for anyone to use.	0.9% (1)	0.9% (1)	4.7% (5)	10.3% (11)	**74.8% (80)**	8.4% (9)	4.71	107
OSLC specifications can be used to create integrations for any set of tools.	5.6% (6)	4.7% (5)	19.6% (21)	**33.6% (36)**	27.1% (29)	9.3% (10)	3.79	107
Anyone can participate in specification development.	2.8% (3)	3.7% (4)	17.8% (19)	25.2% (27)	**38.3% (41)**	12.1% (13)	4.05	107
OSLC integration techniques represent a significant improvement over traditional integration techniques.	0.9% (1)	0.9% (1)	13.1% (14)	29.0% (31)	**44.9% (48)**	11.2% (12)	4.31	107
						answered question		107
						skipped question		1

5. Based on your understanding of OSLC and the challenges of integrating software, to what degree do you agree with the following statements? By using OSLC for software integrations ...

	1 - not at all	2	3 - somewhat	4	5 - completely	N/A or Don't know	Rating Average	Response Count
Organizations can implement leaner and/or more agile processes.	2.9% (3)	7.8% (8)	26.5% (27)	**28.4% (29)**	26.5% (27)	7.8% (8)	3.73	102
Organizations realize cost savings.	2.0% (2)	8.8% (9)	22.5% (23)	**33.3% (34)**	23.5% (24)	9.8% (10)	3.75	102
Organizations increase the value they produce.	1.0% (1)	5.9% (6)	23.8% (24)	**32.7% (33)**	28.7% (29)	7.9% (8)	3.89	101
Organizations improve their business outcomes.	2.0% (2)	4.9% (5)	20.6% (21)	**37.3% (38)**	23.5% (24)	11.8% (12)	3.86	102
						answered question		**102**
						skipped question		**6**

6. Based on your understanding of the OSLC Community, to what degree do you agree with the following statements? The OSLC Community ...

	1 - not at all	2	3 - somewhat	4	5 - completely	N/A or Don't know	Rating Average	Response Count
Has acceptable processes and requirements for participation.	2.2% (2)	2.2% (2)	24.4% (22)	28.9% (26)	10.0% (9)	**32.2% (29)**	3.62	90
Has the right amount of governance.	2.2% (2)	4.4% (4)	24.4% (22)	24.4% (22)	5.6% (5)	**38.9% (35)**	3.44	90
Is open to new ideas and contributions from any member.	1.1% (1)	4.4% (4)	11.1% (10)	32.2% (29)	17.8% (16)	**33.3% (30)**	3.92	90
Makes clear its goals and objectives.	2.2% (2)	6.7% (6)	20.0% (18)	**43.3% (39)**	14.4% (13)	13.3% (12)	3.71	90
Is accessible and helpful to anyone with questions.	1.1% (1)	3.3% (3)	24.4% (22)	23.3% (21)	21.1% (19)	**26.7% (24)**	3.82	90
						answered question		**90**
						skipped question		**18**

7. When did you start participating in an OSLC workgroup?

		Response Percent	Response Count
2012		3.4%	3
2011		9.1%	8
2010		5.7%	5
2009		2.3%	2
2008		8.0%	7
I haven't participated in OSLC; I might in the future		**60.2%**	**53**
I have never considered participating in OSLC		11.4%	10
		answered question	88
		skipped question	20

8. Have you implemented any OSLC specifications?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes – as a consumer		13.6%	12
Yes – as a provider		6.8%	6
Yes – as both a provider and a consumer		21.6%	19
Not yet – I expect to soon		11.4%	10
Not yet – I am considering/investigating it		21.6%	19
No		**25.0%**	**22**
		answered question	88
		skipped question	20

9. Do you use, or have you used, a software solution that is integrated using OSLC? [If you're not sure, take a look at some of the software that implements OSLC here: http://open-services.net/software/]

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, currently		**67.0%**	**59**
Yes, but not anymore		6.8%	6
No		22.7%	20
Don't know		3.4%	3
		answered question	88
		skipped question	20

10. I would like to answer more questions for: (If you want to answer questions in more than one section, please choose in order.)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Workgroup Participants		16.1%	14
Specification Implementers		18.4%	16
End-users		31.0%	27
None of the above		**34.5%**	**30**
		answered question	87
		skipped question	21

11. In which workgroups have you participated?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Core		**58.3%**	**7**
Reporting		25.0%	3
Change Management		50.0%	6
Quality Management		33.3%	4
Requirements Management		33.3%	4
Asset Management		25.0%	3
Architecture Management		25.0%	3
Software Configuration Management		33.3%	4
Automation		25.0%	3
Estimation and Measurement		16.7%	2
Product Lifecycle Management		33.3%	4
Communications		33.3%	4
	answered question		12
	skipped question		96

12. Do you still participate in the workgroups that you selected above?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes (all selected workgroups)		**50.0%**	7
Yes (some of the selected workgroups)		28.6%	4
No		21.4%	3
		answered question	14
		skipped question	94

13. Considering specifications that have been finalized by workgroups in which you participated, how well do you think the final specification:

	1 - not at all	2	3 - somewhat	4	5 - completely	N/A or Don't know	Rating Average	Response Count
Addressed the scenarios the workgroup selected at the beginning?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	7.7% (1)	**61.5% (8)**	15.4% (2)	15.4% (2)	4.09	13
Met the needs of your organization?	0.0% (0)	7.7% (1)	30.8% (4)	**46.2% (6)**	0.0% (0)	15.4% (2)	3.45	13
Met the needs of the industry?	15.4% (2)	0.0% (0)	15.4% (2)	**53.8% (7)**	0.0% (0)	15.4% (2)	3.27	13
						answered question		13
						skipped question		95

14. Considering specifications that you have contributed to that have been finalized, is there anything you'd like to add?

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	105

15. Considering your experiences participating in workgroups, how likely are the following?

	0 - not at all likely	1	2	3	4	5 - somewhat likely	6	7	8	9	
You would recommend your peers (in your organization and beyond) to join a workgroup.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	7.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	**30.8% (4)**	23.1% (3)	
You will continue to participate in the workgroup(s) you've identified above.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	7.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**30.8% (4)**	23.1% (3)	
You would join a new workgroup covering a topic relevant to you.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	7.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	23.1% (3)	23.1% (3)	
											an
											s

16. Is there anything you'd like to add regarding your experiences participating in workgroups?

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	105

17. I would like to answer more questions for: (If you want to answer questions in more than one section, please choose in order.)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Workgroup Participants (about Your Contributions)		27.3%	3
Workgroup Participants (about Tools and Collaboration)		**36.4%**	**4**
Specification Implementers		18.2%	2
End-users		0.0%	0
None of the above		18.2%	2
		answered question	11
		skipped question	97

18. Thinking of all workgroups in which you have participated, in what ways have you contributed?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Developing scenarios		33.3%	1
Selecting scenarios		0.0%	0
Developing specifications		**66.7%**	**2**
Reviewing specifications		**66.7%**	**2**
Developing implementations		0.0%	0
Writing reference documentation		**66.7%**	**2**
Other (please specify)		33.3%	1
		answered question	3
		skipped question	105

19. Thinking of all workgroups in which you have participated, how well do you feel you were able to contribute?

	1 - not at all	2	3 - somewhat	4	5 - completely	N/A or Don't know	Rating Average	Response Count
During scenario development?	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (1)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (1)**	**33.3% (1)**	3.50	3
During scenario selection?	**33.3% (1)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (1)**	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (1)**	2.50	3
During specification development?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (1)**	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (1)**	**33.3% (1)**	4.00	3
During specification review?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (1)**	**33.3% (1)**	**33.3% (1)**	4.50	3
During specification finalization (includes implementations)?	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (1)**	**33.3% (1)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (1)**	2.50	3
Final specification promotion (includes writing reference documentation)?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (1)**	**33.3% (1)**	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (1)**	3.50	3
Overall, throughout the whole process?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (1)	**66.7% (2)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.67	3
						answered question		3
						skipped question		105

20. Considering your contributions to the workgroups in which you have participated, is there anything you'd like to add?

	Response Count
	1
answered question	1
skipped question	107

21. I would like to answer more questions for: (If you want to answer questions in more than one section, please choose in order.)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Workgroup Participants (about Tools and Collaboration)		**66.7%**	**2**
Specification Implementers		0.0%	0
End-users		0.0%	0
None of the above		33.3%	1
		answered question	**3**
		skipped question	**105**

22. How useful have you found the following tools (either provided by open-services.net, or by workgroup participants) for workgroup collaboration?

	1 - not at all	2	3 - somewhat	4	5 - essential	N/A or Don't know	Rating Average	Response Count
Mailing lists	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (2)	16.7% (1)	**50.0% (3)**	0.0% (0)	4.17	6
Wiki	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (2)	**66.7% (4)**	0.0% (0)	4.67	6
Direct email	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	**33.3% (2)**	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	0.0% (0)	3.00	6
Conference call	0.0% (0)	16.7% (1)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (1)	**66.7% (4)**	0.0% (0)	4.33	6
Screen sharing	16.7% (1)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (1)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (3)**	16.7% (1)	3.80	6
Forum	**50.0% (3)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (3)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.50	6
						answered question		6
						skipped question		102

23. Considering the collaborative effort of the workgroups in which you have participated, is there anything you'd like to add?

	Response Count
	2
answered question	2
skipped question	106

24. Which additional tools do you think would be useful for workgroup collaboration?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Work item/issue tracker		**100.0%**	**5**
Instant Messaging/IRC		40.0%	2
Blog		80.0%	4
Calendar		60.0%	3
Planner		40.0%	2
Real-time collaborative editor (e.g. Google Docs)		80.0%	4
Other (please specify)		0.0%	0
	answered question		5
	skipped question		103

25. I would like to answer more questions for: (If you want to answer questions in more than one section, please choose in order.)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Specification Implementers		**50.0%**	**3**
End-users		33.3%	2
None of the above		16.7%	1
	answered question		6
	skipped question		102

26. What were the primary reasons for implementing the specification(s)?

		Response Percent	Response Count
To support specification finalization		20.0%	4
To integrate products my company produces		**45.0%**	**9**
To integrate my product with 3rd party products		**45.0%**	**9**
To integrate established tools with a product my company purchased		30.0%	6
To integrate two (or more) 3rd-party products		30.0%	6
Other (please specify)		5.0%	1
		answered question	20
		skipped question	88

27. Which OSLC specifications have you implemented as a consumer?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Core v1		21.4%	3
Core v2		71.4%	10
Change Management v1		50.0%	7
Change Management v2		**85.7%**	**12**
Quality Management v1		21.4%	3
Quality Management v2		50.0%	7
Requirements Management v1		14.3%	2
Requirements Management v2		50.0%	7
Asset Management v1		14.3%	2
Asset Management v2		14.3%	2
Architecture Management v1		7.1%	1
Architecture Management v2		28.6%	4
Software Configuration Management v1		14.3%	2
		answered question	**14**
		skipped question	**94**

28. Which OSLC specifications have you implemented as a producer?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Core v1		16.7%	2
Core v2		**83.3%**	**10**
Change Management v1		58.3%	7
Change Management v2		66.7%	8
Quality Management v1		16.7%	2
Quality Management v2		33.3%	4
Requirements Management v1		25.0%	3
Requirements Management v2		33.3%	4
Asset Management v1		16.7%	2
Asset Management v2		16.7%	2
Architecture Management v1		8.3%	1
Architecture Management v2		25.0%	3
Software Configuration Management v1		25.0%	3
		answered question	12
		skipped question	96

29. Considering your experiences implementing specifications, how likely are the following?

	0 - not at all likely	1	2	3	4	5 - somewhat likely	6	7	8	9
You would choose to implement another OSLC specification?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.9% (1)	5.9% (1)	**29.4% (5)**	0.0% (0)	11.8% (2)	**29.4% (5)**	11.8% (2)
You would contribute scenarios towards the next revision of a specification?	0.0% (0)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.9% (1)	**23.5% (4)**	0.0% (0)	**23.5% (4)**	17.6% (3)	11.8% (2)
You would contribute scenarios towards a new OSLC specification?	0.0% (0)	5.9% (1)	5.9% (1)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	11.8% (2)	11.8% (2)	**29.4% (5)**	17.6% (3)	0.0% (0)

30. Considering the specification(s) you have implemented, is there anything else you would like to add?

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	105

31. I would like to answer more questions for: (If you want to answer questions in more than one section, please choose in order.)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Specification Implementers (about Other Integration Technologies)		15.8%	3
Specification Implementers (about Your Experience)		26.3%	5
End-users		21.1%	4
None of the above		**36.8%**	**7**
		answered question	19
		skipped question	89

32. What other integration technologies have you used / do you use?

		Response Percent	Response Count
CORBA		33.3%	1
OSGi		0.0%	0
Custom/proprietary API		**66.7%**	**2**
ESB		33.3%	1
SOAP		**66.7%**	**2**
Other (please specify)		0.0%	0
		answered question	3
		skipped question	105

33. Which integration technologies do you prefer?

	1 - not at all	2	3 - somewhat	4	5 - preference	N/A or Don't know	Rating Average	Response Count
CORBA	50.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	3.00	2
OSGi	100.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.00	1
Custom/proprietary API	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	5.00	1
ESB	50.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	3.00	2
SOAP	33.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	3.00	3
OSLC	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.67	3
Other (specify below)	100.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.00	1

Other (if ranked above)	0
answered question	3
skipped question	105

34. Considering your OSLC integrations, in comparisons to other integrations, how would you rank them with respect to these software qualities?

	1 - poor	2	3 - average	4	5 - superior	N/A or Don't know	Rating Average	Response Count
Reliability	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (1)**	**50.0% (1)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.50	2
Efficiency	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (1)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (1)**	3.00	2
Security	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (1)**	**50.0% (1)**	0.0% (0)	4.50	2
Maintainability	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (1)**	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (1)**	0.0% (0)	4.00	2
Scalability	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (1)**	**50.0% (1)**	5.00	2
Reusability	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (1)**	**50.0% (1)**	0.0% (0)	4.50	2
Simplicity	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (1)**	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (1)**	4.00	2
Debugability	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**100.0% (2)**	0.0% (0)	5.00	2
						answered question		**2**
						skipped question		**106**

35. Considering OSLC and other integration technologies with which you have experience, is there anything you would like to add?

	Response Count
	1
answered question	**1**
skipped question	**107**

36. I would like to answer more questions for: (If you want to answer questions in more than one section, please choose in order.)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Specification Implementers (about Your Experience)		**66.7%**	2
End-users		0.0%	0
None of the above		33.3%	1
	answered question		3
	skipped question		105

37. How would you rank the ease with which you understood and/or implemented the following?

	1 - only with herioc effort	2	3 - average effort	4	5 - trivial effort	N/A or Don't know	Rating Average	Response Count
Concepts of Linked Data	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**42.9% (3)**	28.6% (2)	28.6% (2)	0.0% (0)	3.86	7
Scenarios addressed by the specification	0.0% (0)	28.6% (2)	14.3% (1)	**57.1% (4)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.29	7
RDF	0.0% (0)	28.6% (2)	**42.9% (3)**	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	3.14	7
SPARQL	0.0% (0)	**33.3% (2)**	0.0% (0)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	**33.3% (2)**	3.25	6
OAuth	28.6% (2)	**42.9% (3)**	14.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	14.3% (1)	1.83	7
RESTful APIs	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**57.1% (4)**	14.3% (1)	28.6% (2)	0.0% (0)	3.71	7
					answered question			7
					skipped question			101

38. Considering your effort to implement the specification, how did the following help or hinder you?

	1 - more trouble than worth	2	3 - somewhat	4	5 - surpassing all expectations	N/A or Don't know	Rating Average	Response Count
Final specification document	0.0% (0)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	**71.4% (5)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.57	
Scenario descriptions	**16.7% (1)**	**16.7% (1)**	**16.7% (1)**	**16.7% (1)**	**16.7% (1)**	**16.7% (1)**	3.00	
Other workgroup documents	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (2)	0.0% (0)	**66.7% (4)**	4.00	
Your own participation in specification development	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	**50.0% (3)**	4.00	
Mailing lists and forums	0.0% (0)	28.6% (2)	14.3% (1)	**42.9% (3)**	0.0% (0)	14.3% (1)	3.17	
Access to a reference implementation	14.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	14.3% (1)	**28.6% (2)**	14.3% (1)	**28.6% (2)**	3.40	
OSCL-specific development tools (e.g. Eclipse Lyo)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**42.9% (3)**	28.6% (2)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	3.67	
Access to test suites (e.g.existing implementations of the "other side")	14.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	**28.6% (2)**	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	**28.6% (2)**	3.20	
Tutorials on open-services.net	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	14.3% (1)	**28.6% (2)**	**28.6% (2)**	28.6% (2)	4.20	
Other (please specify below)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**83.3% (5)**	2.00	

Other (if ranked above)

answered question	
skipped question	10

39. Considering your experience implementing specifications, improvements in which area (s), would help you the next time you implement a specification?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Final specification document		42.9%	3
Scenario descriptions		42.9%	3
Other workgroup documents		0.0%	0
Participation in the specification development process		0.0%	0
Mailing lists and forums		42.9%	3
Access to a reference implementation		**85.7%**	**6**
OSLC-specific development tools (e.g. Eclipse Lyo)		71.4%	5
Access to test suites (e.g. existing implementations of the "other side")		57.1%	4
Other (please specify)		14.3%	1
	answered question		7
	skipped question		101

40. I would like to answer more questions for:

		Response Percent	Response Count
End-users		33.3%	2
None of the above		**66.7%**	**4**
	answered question		6
	skipped question		102

41. Where have the OSLC integrations you've used come from?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Built-in to 3rd-party software		**69.7%**	23
Publically-available adapter to 3rd-party software		12.1%	4
Custom-built integration		36.4%	12
Don't know		9.1%	3
		answered question	33
		skipped question	75

42. Considering your experience using products integrated with OSLC, to what degree do you agree with the following statements?

	1 - not at all	2	3 - somewhat	4	5 - completely	N/A or Don't know	Rating Average	Response Count
I use the delegated UI (hover details) feature regularly	0.0% (0)	9.1% (3)	24.2% (8)	24.2% (8)	**33.3% (11)**	9.1% (3)	3.90	33
The integration gives me improved traceability across artifacts and through my process.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	14.7% (5)	32.4% (11)	**44.1% (15)**	8.8% (3)	4.32	34
The integration saves me time and effort.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	18.2% (6)	**39.4% (13)**	33.3% (11)	9.1% (3)	4.17	33
It was easy to start using the integration.	0.0% (0)	12.1% (4)	15.2% (5)	**45.5% (15)**	21.2% (7)	6.1% (2)	3.81	33
						answered question		34
						skipped question		74

43. Considering your experience using OSLC integrations, is there anything else you would like to add?

	Response Count
	9
answered question	9
skipped question	99

44. In what country do you reside? (sorted by TLD)

		Response Percent	Response Count
ad Andorra		0.0%	0
ae United Arab Emirates		0.0%	0
af Afghanistan		0.0%	0
ag Antigua and Barbuda		0.0%	0
ai Anguilla		0.0%	0
al Albania		0.0%	0
am Armenia		0.0%	0
an Netherlands Antilles		0.0%	0
ao Angola		0.0%	0
aq Antarctica		0.0%	0
ar Argentina		0.0%	0
as American Samoa		0.0%	0
at Austria		1.2%	1
au Australia		1.2%	1
aw Aruba		0.0%	0
az Azerbaijan		0.0%	0
ba Bosnia and Herzegovina		0.0%	0
bb Barbados		0.0%	0
bd Bangladesh		0.0%	0
be Belgium		3.7%	3
bf Burkina Faso		0.0%	0
bg Bulgaria		0.0%	0
bh Bahrain		0.0%	0

bi Burundi		0.0%	0
bj Benin		0.0%	0
bm Bermuda		0.0%	0
bn Brunei		0.0%	0
bo Bolivia		0.0%	0
br Brazil		1.2%	1
bs Bahamas, The		0.0%	0
bt Bhutan		0.0%	0
bv Bouvet Island		0.0%	0
bw Botswana		0.0%	0
by Belarus		0.0%	0
bz Belize		0.0%	0
ca Canada		13.6%	11
cc Cocos (Keeling) Islands		1.2%	1
cd Congo, Democratic Republic of the		0.0%	0
cf Central African Republic		0.0%	0
cg Congo, Republic of the		0.0%	0
ch Switzerland		0.0%	0
ci Cote d'Ivoire		0.0%	0
ck Cook Islands		0.0%	0
cl Chile		0.0%	0
cm Cameroon		0.0%	0
cn China		1.2%	1
co Colombia		0.0%	0
cr Costa Rica		0.0%	0

cs Serbia and Montenegro		0.0%	0
cu Cuba		0.0%	0
cv Cape Verde		0.0%	0
cx Christmas Island		0.0%	0
cy Cyprus		0.0%	0
cz Czech Republic		0.0%	0
de Germany		6.2%	5
dj Djibouti		0.0%	0
dk Denmark		0.0%	0
dm Dominica		0.0%	0
do Dominican Republic		0.0%	0
dz Algeria		0.0%	0
ec Ecuador		0.0%	0
ee Estonia		0.0%	0
eg Egypt		0.0%	0
eh Western Sahara		0.0%	0
er Eritrea		0.0%	0
es Spain		1.2%	1
et Ethiopia		0.0%	0
fi Finland		0.0%	0
fj Fiji		0.0%	0
fk Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas)		0.0%	0
fm Micronesia, Federated States of		0.0%	0
fo Faroe Islands		0.0%	0
fr France		7.4%	6
ga Gabon		0.0%	0

gd Grenada		0.0%	0
ge Georgia		0.0%	0
gf French Guiana		0.0%	0
gg Guernsey		0.0%	0
gh Ghana		0.0%	0
gi Gibraltar		0.0%	0
gl Greenland		0.0%	0
gm Gambia, The		0.0%	0
gn Guinea		0.0%	0
gp Guadeloupe		0.0%	0
gq Equatorial Guinea		0.0%	0
gr Greece		0.0%	0
gs South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands		0.0%	0
gt Guatemala		0.0%	0
gu Guam		0.0%	0
gw Guinea-Bissau		0.0%	0
gy Guyana		0.0%	0
hk Hong Kong		0.0%	0
hm Heard Island and McDonald Islands		0.0%	0
hn Honduras		0.0%	0
hr Croatia		0.0%	0
ht Haiti		0.0%	0
hu Hungary		0.0%	0
id Indonesia		0.0%	0

ie Ireland		1.2%	1
il Israel		1.2%	1
im Isle of Man		0.0%	0
in India		3.7%	3
io British Indian Ocean Territory		0.0%	0
iq Iraq		0.0%	0
ir Iran		0.0%	0
is Iceland		0.0%	0
it Italy		1.2%	1
je Jersey		0.0%	0
jm Jamaica		0.0%	0
jo Jordan		0.0%	0
jp Japan		1.2%	1
ke Kenya		0.0%	0
kg Kyrgyzstan		0.0%	0
kh Cambodia		0.0%	0
ki Kiribati		0.0%	0
kn Saint Kitts and Nevis		0.0%	0
kp Korea, North		0.0%	0
kr Korea, South		3.7%	3
kw Kuwait		0.0%	0
ky Cayman Islands		0.0%	0
kz Kazakhstan		0.0%	0
la Laos		0.0%	0
lb Lebanon		0.0%	0
lc Saint Lucia		0.0%	0

li Liechtenstein		0.0%	0
lk Sri Lanka		0.0%	0
lr Liberia		0.0%	0
ls Lesotho		0.0%	0
lt Lithuania		0.0%	0
lu Luxembourg		0.0%	0
lv Latvia		0.0%	0
ly Libya		0.0%	0
ma Morocco		0.0%	0
mc Monaco		0.0%	0
md Moldova		0.0%	0
mg Madagascar		0.0%	0
mh Marshall Islands		0.0%	0
mk Macedonia		0.0%	0
ml Mali		0.0%	0
mm Burma		0.0%	0
mn Mongolia		0.0%	0
mo Macau		0.0%	0
mp Northern Mariana Islands		0.0%	0
mq Martinique		0.0%	0
mr Mauritania		0.0%	0
ms Montserrat		0.0%	0
mt Malta		0.0%	0
mu Mauritius		0.0%	0
mv Maldives		0.0%	0
mw Malawi		0.0%	0

mx Mexico		1.2%	1
my Malaysia		0.0%	0
mz Mozambique		0.0%	0
na Namibia		0.0%	0
nc New Caledonia		0.0%	0
ne Niger		0.0%	0
nf Norfolk Island		0.0%	0
ng Nigeria		0.0%	0
ni Nicaragua		0.0%	0
nl Netherlands		0.0%	0
no Norway		0.0%	0
np Nepal		0.0%	0
nr Nauru		0.0%	0
nu Niue		0.0%	0
nz New Zealand		0.0%	0
om Oman		0.0%	0
pa Panama		0.0%	0
pe Peru		0.0%	0
pf French Polynesia		0.0%	0
pg Papua New Guinea		0.0%	0
ph Philippines		0.0%	0
pk Pakistan		0.0%	0
pl Poland		0.0%	0
pm Saint Pierre and Miquelon		0.0%	0
pn Pitcairn Islands		0.0%	0

pr Puerto Rico		0.0%	0
ps West Bank		0.0%	0
pt Portugal		0.0%	0
pw Palau		0.0%	0
py Paraguay		0.0%	0
qa Qatar		0.0%	0
re Reunion		0.0%	0
ro Romania		0.0%	0
ru Russia		0.0%	0
rw Rwanda		0.0%	0
sa Saudi Arabia		0.0%	0
sb Solomon Islands		0.0%	0
sc Seychelles		0.0%	0
sd Sudan		0.0%	0
se Sweden	▪	3.7%	3
sg Singapore		0.0%	0
sh Saint Helena		0.0%	0
si Slovenia		0.0%	0
sj Svalbard		0.0%	0
sk Slovakia		0.0%	0
sl Sierra Leone		0.0%	0
sm San Marino		0.0%	0
sn Senegal		0.0%	0
so Somalia		0.0%	0
sr Suriname		0.0%	0
st Sao Tome and Principe		0.0%	0

sv El Salvador		0.0%	0
sy Syria		0.0%	0
sz Swaziland		0.0%	0
tc Turks and Caicos Islands		0.0%	0
td Chad		0.0%	0
tf French Southern and Antarctic Lands		0.0%	0
tg Togo		0.0%	0
th Thailand		0.0%	0
tj Tajikistan		0.0%	0
tk Tokelau		0.0%	0
tm Turkmenistan		0.0%	0
tn Tunisia		0.0%	0
to Tonga		0.0%	0
tp Timor-Leste		0.0%	0
tr Turkey		0.0%	0
tt Trinidad and Tobago		0.0%	0
tv Tuvalu		0.0%	0
tw Taiwan		0.0%	0
tz Tanzania		0.0%	0
ua Ukraine		0.0%	0
ug Uganda		0.0%	0
uk United Kingdom		8.6%	7
us United States		**35.8%**	**29**
uy Uruguay		0.0%	0
uz Uzbekistan		0.0%	0

va Holy See (Vatican City)		0.0%	0
vc Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		0.0%	0
ve Venezuela		0.0%	0
vg British Virgin Islands		0.0%	0
vi Virgin Islands		0.0%	0
vn Vietnam		0.0%	0
vu Vanuatu		0.0%	0
wf Wallis and Futuna		0.0%	0
ws Samoa		0.0%	0
ye Yemen		0.0%	0
yt Mayotte		0.0%	0
za South Africa		0.0%	0
zm Zambia		0.0%	0
zw Zimbabwe		0.0%	0
		answered question	**81**
		skipped question	**27**

45. How many years of relevant professional experience do you have?

		Response Percent	Response Count
None		2.4%	2
Less than 2 years		3.6%	3
2-5 years		4.8%	4
6-10 years		15.7%	13
11-15 years		27.7%	23
16-20 years		15.7%	13
More than 20 years		**30.1%**	**25**
		answered question	83
		skipped question	25

46. Which of the following most closely describes your industry?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Aerospace & Defense		8.5%	7
Automotive		2.4%	2
Banking		4.9%	4
Chemicals & Petroleum		0.0%	0
Computer Services		**56.1%**	**46**
Consumer Products		0.0%	0
Education		1.2%	1
Electronics		1.2%	1
Energy & Utilities		0.0%	0
Exclusions		0.0%	0
Financial Markets		2.4%	2
Government, Central/Federal		2.4%	2
Government, State/Provincial/Local		0.0%	0
Healthcare		0.0%	0
Industrial Products		0.0%	0
Insurance		1.2%	1
Life Sciences		0.0%	0
Media & Entertainment		0.0%	0
Professional Services		12.2%	10
Retail		0.0%	0
Telecommunications		4.9%	4
Travel & Transportation		1.2%	1
Wholesale Distribution & Services		1.2%	1

	answered question	82
	skipped question	26

47. What is your best estimate of how many employees work at your organization?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Individual, not affiliated with an organization		2.5%	2
<5		2.5%	2
5-9		0.0%	0
10-19		4.9%	4
20-49		7.4%	6
50-99		1.2%	1
100-249		2.5%	2
250-499		4.9%	4
500-999		0.0%	0
1000-2499		2.5%	2
2500-4999		1.2%	1
5000-9999		7.4%	6
10000-25000		7.4%	6
>25000		**55.6%**	**45**
	answered question	81
	skipped question	27

48. Which of these titles best fits your role in the organization?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Business Executive	0.0%	0
Business Manager/Professional	7.0%	5
Chief Executive Officer	1.4%	1
Chief Information Officer	0.0%	0
Education Professional	2.8%	2
Government Leader/Professional	0.0%	0
Investor	0.0%	0
IT Manager	15.5%	11
IT Professional	**70.4%**	**50**
Press/Analyst	0.0%	0
Prospective Employee	0.0%	0
Student	2.8%	2
Other (please specify)		12
answered question		**71**
skipped question		**37**

49. Thinking about OSLC, in general, is there anything else you would like to add?

	Response Count
	22
answered question	**22**
skipped question	**86**

Page 2, Q3. How have you heard/learnt about OSLC?		
1	email webinar invitation	Mar 29, 2012 1:54 PM
2	internal company presentation	Mar 23, 2012 11:25 AM
3	IBMer (regarding integration with RRC)	Mar 20, 2012 2:36 PM
4	IBM Employees	Mar 17, 2012 6:34 AM
5	I am a Rational employee	Mar 15, 2012 2:43 PM
6	IBM Rational Software Conference	Mar 11, 2012 5:47 PM
7	IBM employees	Mar 9, 2012 2:04 PM
8	IBM Pulse	Mar 5, 2012 3:48 PM
9	Another IBM Group Member	Mar 2, 2012 8:49 AM
10	Mylyn	Mar 2, 2012 8:36 AM
11	EU projects	Mar 2, 2012 4:49 AM
12	Coclico Project	Mar 2, 2012 4:19 AM
13	Manager - IBM internal discussion	Mar 1, 2012 2:51 PM
14	References in a bugtracker comment	Mar 1, 2012 11:53 AM
15	Sean Kennedy IBM Employee	Feb 29, 2012 10:34 PM

Page 7, Q14. Considering specifications that you have contributed to that have been finalized, is there anything you'd like to add?		
1	The most successful specs are based on existing products. It's hard to define specs for new domains.	Mar 15, 2012 2:48 PM
2	Would like to make sure we do a better job explaining how the scenarios are solved by the final specs	Mar 1, 2012 11:02 PM
3	I believe that the specifications seem to be hard to parse to find certain details unless you've become familiar with the organization of the information across multiple wiki pages. The wiki pages are a great way to collaborate developing the specification, but not easy to read once published.	Mar 1, 2012 7:34 PM

Page 7, Q16. Is there anything you'd like to add regarding your experiences participating in workgroups?

1	It's a big time commitment. It has to be aligned with my day job.	Mar 15, 2012 2:48 PM
2	A decent/simple/OSLC-enabled issue tracker would help. Think it would be good to have a dashboard and better consistency between workgroups	Mar 1, 2012 11:02 PM
3	The PLM/ALM team did a really good job of analyzing scenarios formally. Formal discussion and documentation of the scenario - e.g. the workflow supported by an integration - will help improve the specification, and the eventual implementation.	Mar 1, 2012 7:34 PM

Page 8, Q18. Thinking of all workgroups in which you have participated, in what ways have you contributed?

1	organization	Feb 29, 2012 9:26 PM

Page 8, Q20. Considering your contributions to the workgroups in which you have participated, is there anything you'd like to add?

1	We need an issue tracking system. Wikis are not good for writing formal specs. We need better document control.	Mar 15, 2012 2:50 PM

Page 9, Q23. Considering the collaborative effort of the workgroups in which you have participated, is there anything you'd like to add?

1	The lack of use of the forum is unfortunate. Forums are a great way to have searchable threads of communication, but the community has to commit to using them.	Mar 1, 2012 7:40 PM
2	it would be great if the mailing lists and the forum could be tied together	Feb 29, 2012 9:28 PM

Page 10, Q26. What were the primary reasons for implementing the specification(s)?

1	To support them in Open Source tools we contribute to	Mar 1, 2012 11:58 AM

Page 11, Q30. Considering the specification(s) you have implemented, is there anything else you would like to add?

1	Given that I heard about you only 5 minutes ago, I don't have more to add. But what you are doing scratches an itch I have for our products.	Mar 29, 2012 1:57 PM
2	Yet I do not know because you've never used a lot. If you have the opportunity to try using the future will tell.	Mar 26, 2012 9:09 PM
3	We can access only basic information using the current specifications. There are few scenarios and each scenario expose few atributes. There are a lot of work to do.	Mar 9, 2012 10:55 AM

Page 12, Q35. Considering OSLC and other integration technologies with which you have experience, is there anything you would like to add?

| 1 | Not | Mar 26, 2012 9:11 PM |

Page 13, Q38. Considering your effort to implement the specification, how did the following help or hinder you?

| 1 | Started implementation before some of this even existed | Mar 27, 2012 4:24 AM |

Page 13, Q39. Considering your experience implementing specifications, improvements in which area(s), would help you the next time you implement a specification?

| 1 | Oauth | Mar 27, 2012 4:24 AM |

	Page 14, Q43. Considering your experience using OSLC integrations, is there anything else you would like to add?	
1	OSLC needs a governance body More industry relevant content/specifiactions are needed (e.g. safety, traceability)	Mar 12, 2012 7:00 AM
2	- Missing scenarios - Missing attributes Example: From the Configuration Management perspective we have to access the revisions / history. Not only the last information of the artifact.	Mar 9, 2012 10:59 AM
3	Still tricky in a compliance scenario to make sure the link is pointing not only to the right object but also the right version of an object. Unsure how to quickly find and fix dangling references or suspect links.	Mar 5, 2012 3:58 AM
4	More examples please Thanks in advance	Mar 2, 2012 12:19 PM
5	Linking is only half of my problem. I want to be aware of the life cycle changes to the things I have linked to. Our tools provide a way to experience notifications and I would like to aggregate these life cycle notifications in the same spot.	Mar 2, 2012 8:54 AM
6	1. PERFORMANCE MUST BE GOOD. 2, PORTABILITY -- Link stuff between two tools, then send the stuff to someone else.	Mar 2, 2012 1:41 AM
7	We need consistency across different implementations.	Mar 1, 2012 4:29 PM
8	no	Mar 1, 2012 8:20 AM
9	Having used products integrated by OSLC (the Jazz CLM suite) I would never choose to go back to previous tools. With the integration, it feels like I'm using a single product instead of multiple integrated products.	Feb 29, 2012 9:30 PM

Page 15, Q48. Which of these titles best fits your role in the organization?		
1	Product manager and architect	Mar 29, 2012 1:58 PM
2	probation	Mar 26, 2012 9:28 PM
3	VP, Product Development	Mar 26, 2012 12:55 PM
4	Project Manager	Mar 22, 2012 12:08 PM
5	Researcher	Mar 22, 2012 4:50 AM
6	Systems Engineer	Mar 17, 2012 11:00 AM
7	CTO	Mar 17, 2012 6:36 AM
8	Software Engineer	Mar 12, 2012 2:19 PM
9	research scientist	Mar 10, 2012 9:36 AM
10	author	Mar 9, 2012 5:28 PM
11	CTO / IT Architect	Mar 3, 2012 5:49 PM
12	Product Designer for IBM	Mar 2, 2012 8:56 AM

Page 16, Q49. Thinking about OSLC, in general, is there anything else you would like to add?	
1	Scratches an important itch.	Mar 29, 2012 1:59 PM
2	no	Mar 28, 2012 12:52 PM
3	nothing	Mar 26, 2012 9:29 PM
4	Not Thanks	Mar 26, 2012 9:14 PM
5	I hope that you can tackle HP and add their suite of products to your quiver. Without them, it may be difficult to gain mainstream acceptance and extend beyond the open source community. Regardless of how great an idea that this is.	Mar 26, 2012 6:33 PM
6	Focus more on conceptual model and RDF vocabularies. Use standard for other REST API best practices to avoid variation across domains.	Mar 15, 2012 2:52 PM
7	Guys did a good job !!	Mar 15, 2012 9:03 AM
8	Great Idea! The community is more important than the technology! We need more tool vendor buy in into OSLC. OSLC must be extended from software domain to systems (embedded systems) domain.	Mar 12, 2012 7:02 AM
9	OSLC community should pay attention to semantic aspects: they are really important for end users. Semantic specifications from other initiatives should be considered in oredr to speed up the evolution of the specification and its acceptance from the users community.	Mar 12, 2012 4:47 AM
10	OSLC spec provioder should also implement a tool wjich can be used to validate implementation of a provider or consumer. Different providers or consumers can implement the spec differently, loosing the generality. If a tool was there, all providers/consumers could test their implementation against it and ensure that it wil work all the implemtation of OSLC.	Mar 5, 2012 2:20 PM
11	It is a great initiative. the RM concepts are well defined but the others working groups provide basic concepts. In my opinion, a cross domain generic concepts are missing such ase traceability and linkdata.	Mar 5, 2012 1:23 PM
12	In general, it is the best tool integration architecture I've ever seen. We need to improve some things: 1. vastly increase adoption by lowering the bar for implementation: e.g. a "OSLC-enabler" code generator to wrap existing services and expose the data model as resouces 2. support more automation/"process" - e.g. how to implement "suspect link" notification/flagging on a testcase after requirements change? currently, links are quite "dumb" 3. make a more user-friendly and nice web-site - the current wiki is too hard to digest!	Mar 5, 2012 4:40 AM
13	The rate of positive change is great, the quality improvements at each step are great, the community is great. Now if only all open source tool providers would pick up on OSLC... Apparently some tools can do without an architecture but I say no tool can do without OSLC.	Mar 5, 2012 4:01 AM
14	OSLC SCM is missing	Mar 2, 2012 12:20 PM
15	I answered this based on how our core persona would have responded. Its based on insight and interviews I have had with our customers that I believe will	Mar 2, 2012 8:58 AM

	improve OSLC. I would like to participate with any working group that pushes out OSLC notifications, etc. Chris Berg IBM, Product Designer bergc@us.ibm.com	
16	It must a) be easy to install, b) have good performance, c) be portable -- move the combined solution from one place to another, as a deliverable.	Mar 2, 2012 1:43 AM
17	The open community aspect is key. The technology basis on Linked Data is essential. The combination is extremely valuable, I would like to see these essential core values remain and reinforced as the community grows.	Mar 1, 2012 11:07 PM
18	I see examples of CM spec. However, there is almost less information about the rest of OSLC implementation. I think this is one of bottleneck of adopting OSLC. CM spec is easy one, but if we do not take the rest, this OSLC idea will break in the near future.	Mar 1, 2012 9:17 PM
19	We wish for other big players to oin the movement	Mar 1, 2012 8:42 PM
20	More guidance / education materials for implementers. More focus on scenario definition. Specs should be structured around scenarios, and not around domains. The domains pigeon-holes what resources are supported, and the MUST requirements that individual providers may not be able to support. At a minimum, the MUST, SHOULD, and MAY guidance should be around scenarios to allow implementers to focus on supporting scenarios, rather than a specification.	Mar 1, 2012 7:53 PM
21	Great survey	Mar 1, 2012 12:03 PM
22	There is a lot of promise to OSLC, some has been realized, I look forward to when more is.	Feb 29, 2012 9:31 PM