


Q2 - In what capacity did you interact with [AD] in their role as an Area Director? (check all t...




Field	Choice Count
As a member of IESG	54.13% 118
As a working group chair the AD oversees	34.86% 76
As the shepherd of an Internet-Draft the AD reviewed	22.02% 48
A member of a directorate	12.39% 27
As a member of the secretariat, IAB or LLC	15.60% 34
Other (please provide details)	5.05% 11

218

Showing rows 1 - 7 of 7

Q3 - Overall, how does the [Field-AD]'s performance match your expectations of an Area Dir...




Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
Overall, how does the [Field-AD]'s performance match your expectations of an Area Director?	3.96	0.92	0.85	200	6.50%	68.50%

#	Field	Choice Count
1	Much worse than my expectations	0.00% 0
2	Somewhat worse	6.50% 13
3	Roughly met my expectations	25.00% 50
4	Somewhat better	34.50% 69
5	Much better than my expectations	34.00% 68
		200

Showing rows 1 - 6 of 6


Q4 - How would you characterize the actions taken by [Field-AD] as an Area Director?



Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
How would you characterize the actions taken by [Field-AD] as an Area Director?	0.00	0.23	0.05	193

#	Field	Choice Count
0	They did about as much as appropriate	94.82% 183
1	They overstepped their bounds in taking on too much control and responsibility	2.59% 5
-1	They forfeited too much control and left it to others to do their job	2.59% 5
		193

Q5 - How would you characterize [Field-AD]'s overall management of the area they are resp...




Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
How would you characterize [Field-AD]'s overall management of the area they are responsible for?	-0.05	0.28	0.08	131

#	Field	Choice Count
0	They spend the right amount of time on the management of the area	91.60% 120
1	They spend too much time on the management of the area	1.53% 2
-1	They don't spend enough time on the management of the area	6.87% 9
		131

Showing rows 1 - 4 of 4

Q6 - What is your impression of [Field-AD]'s participation in process-related and other non-t...




Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
What is your impression of [Field-AD]'s participation in process-related and other non-technical IESG initiatives?	3.31	0.70	0.48	179	13.41%	86.59%

#	Field	Choice Count
1	Actively harmful to progress	0.00% 0
2	Does not make a contribution	13.41% 24
3	Makes minor contribution	41.90% 75
4	Makes major contribution	44.69% 80

179

Showing rows 1 - 5 of 5

Q7 - What best describes the quality of Internet-Drafts that [Field-AD] reviewed and submitte...




Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count	Bottom 1 Box	Top 2 Box
What best describes the quality of Internet-Drafts that [Field-AD] reviewed and submitted to IETF Last Call?	2.36	0.57	0.33	144	4.86%	95.14%

#	Field	Choice Count
1	More significant problems than average	4.86% 7
2	About the same severity of problems	54.17% 78
3	Fewer significant problems than average	40.97% 59
		144

Showing rows 1 - 4 of 4

Q8 - What best describes [Field-AD]'s IESG reviews of Internet-Drafts submitted by other A...




Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
What best describes [Field-AD]'s IESG reviews of Internet-Drafts submitted by other ADs?	3.12	0.66	0.43	134	16.42%	83.58%

#	Field	Choice Count
1	Achieved little and resulted in unbearable process and delay	0.00% 0
2	Had no significant impact on the process	16.42% 22
3	Made minor improvements for an acceptable amount of effort	55.22% 74
4	Sometimes uncovered significant problems that would have resulted in a flawed spec	28.36% 38

134

Q9 - In the Working Groups you chair, did [Field-AD] make ...




Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
In the Working Groups you chair, did [Field-AD] make ...	4.14	0.75	0.56	73	0.00%	78.08%

#	Field	Choice Count
1	... the WG effort much worse	0.00% 0
2	... the WG effort slightly worse	0.00% 0
3	... little or no impact on WG progress	21.92% 16
4	... the WG effort slightly better	42.47% 31
5	... significant contributions to keeping the WG moving in the right direction	35.62% 26
		73



Q10 - How would you characterize [Field-AD]'s oral and written communication skills?




Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count	Bottom 1 Box	Top 2 Box
How would you characterize [Field-AD]'s oral and written communication skills?	2.63	0.51	0.26	203	1.48%	98.52%

#	Field	Choice Count
1	Their oral and written skills need improvement	1.48% 3
2	Their oral and written skills are appropriate	33.99% 69
3	Their oral and written skills are excellent	64.53% 131
		203

Showing rows 1 - 4 of 4

Q11 - How would you characterize [Field-AD]'s availability?




Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count	Bottom 1 Box	Top 2 Box
How would you characterize [Field-AD]'s availability?	2.20	0.54	0.30	193	6.74%	93.26%

#	Field	Choice Count
1	They are hard to reach	6.74% 13
2	They respond in a timely manner	66.32% 128
3	They are always available	26.94% 52
		193

Showing rows 1 - 4 of 4

Q12 - Did you experience behavior by [Field-AD] that you considered inappropriate or unprof...



#	Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Did you experience behavior by [Field-AD] that you considered inappropriate or unprofessional?	1.99	0.10	0.01	204

#	Field	Choice Count
1	Yes	0.98% 2
2	No	99.02% 202
		204

Showing rows 1 - 3 of 3