

Analysis of responses to the Remote Connectathon Questionnaire

Charles Parisot, Chair IHE-Services
Draft V3– July 6th, 2020.

IHE Europe has been exploring the subject of performing future IHE Connectathons with a remote component.

We have been considering this for quite some time and realize that to effectively address participants' needs with credible, collaborative and robust testing, many technical, organizational and process challenges must be overcome. We are prioritizing this initiative due to COVID 19 and need your input.

Please note, IHE Europe is conducting a thorough analysis on this topic and has not reached a decision as to whether any remote capabilities will be available for the November 2020 IHE Connectathon.

The results from this survey will help us in developing technical, logistical and resource requirements necessary to support remote testing. We are soliciting your input to understand whether remote testing is worth pursuing and, if so, for which types of testing.

Below, you will find the analysis of the 104 responses received to the 14 questions (each in the highlighted yellow table heading below)

Analysis of Responses

The 104 respondents to the questionnaire had a good experience with the subtle process that allows the success and effectiveness of IHE Connectathons:

- 93% participated to one or more Connectathons
- 46% participated in at least 4 Connectathons
- 30% participated in at least 7 Connectathons

What do you see as the benefit of the face to face IHE Connectathon event?	
Interact with test partners (e.g. review logs and error messages) to troubleshoot interoperability issues directly related to testing,	84%
Interactions with IHE Connectathon staff related to testing (configuration, education, test and tool network issues, informal discussions, etc..),	68%
Complete as many peer and group tests as possible within one week	67%
Interact with global test partners in the same time zone (e.g. 9-5:30 central European time),	70%
Interactions with test partners on interoperability issues tangential to, but not directly related to testing (configuration, education, network issues, informal discussions, etc..),	60%
Takeaway: Testing what I am supposed to test is important, but just behind is sharing technical expertise/learning, and taking advantage of the community effect. f-t-f delivers this high value, this value would have to be transposed to remote.	
<p>Respondents that added a specific reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Put a face on names and social interaction - Meet friends and talk with developers about working conditions in other companies and countries - Reduction of CO2 pollution; Possibility of extension to permanent testing, etc. - Networking with several engineers. - Direct social contact with test partners and IHE staff, F2F discussions, conversations,.. - Establish relations with other vendors - Participants are completely available/focused on testing for 8 continuous hours on 4+ continuous days. - Get a concrete sense of maturity and adoption of IHE Profiles - Team building - Food + the "travelling" aspect (new city, new venue) - Having the IHE experts who wrote most of the profiles present for questions and discussions. - Working environment sets the mind ("We are all there"). Community effect. 	12%

Do you see value in offering remote testing at the Connectathon simultaneously to the F2F event? (please select one)	
No, a mix of remote and F2F testing is too difficult to manage. A remote event should be separate	35%
Yes, all testing shall be offered remotely at the same time as the F2F	26%
Yes, however, only certain types of tests should be offered	26%
Takeaway: No clear dominant direction on how remote should be introduced among the three ways proposed. 65% say that having a mixed approach makes sense. To analyse further: Doing remote testing, where possible before the face to face and get credit or fix ahead, fear of losing f-t-f value.	
<p>Respondents that added a specific reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vote for pure remote CAT to spare costs for F2F better invested otherwise - Try and see. I think this question can only be answered having experience. Participants should not expect to gain the same value for the first occurrence. I would like to try mixed events. - in the current situation (COVID19) -> YES - remote would be very valuable, but informal testing/networking is also of major interest to me. - First Choice = All! We experienced a good mix during CH -PAT (Having the System online and being present on Site) - Whether the total value of adding remote testing is positive or negative, has to be tried out. On the positive side, there might be more total participants, and therefore more testing partners, and those testing partners might have resources more readily available within their companies. On the negative side, remoteness might cause testing partners to be less readily available to talk to, or they might be more easily distracted by other work within their companies. - Yes, but the value for the vendors is much less than participating to the F2F event - Yes, however only certain types of tests, and remote participants need to commit to certain levels of availability and participation - No, I am afraid offering remote testing possibilities will severely limit the number of participants in the F2F event and with that, defeat its purpose. - As a monitor I do not care about remote/onsite. I will not travel in 2020 so everyone will be remote from my perspective. - We see value in offering remote testing Connectathon regardless of the F2F option - Yes, however, troubleshoot will be complex remotely... - Tests that require physical media cannot be tested online. - Yes, for all testing, only when remote test should support the way of interactions with test partners and IHE Connectathon staff. 	13%

Content-only profile sample testing: Content creator uploads, validates and a monitor checks content. Content consumer downloads, and a monitor checks consumption/display.	
Remote Only	44%
Face to Face only	10%
Remote and Face to face	44%
Takeaway: Remote is clearly preferred (88% versus 54%). Both expected by 44%. To be analyzed: introduce Shareathon	
Respondents that added a specific reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use Videoconferencing if F2F is not possible (May be an Bandwidth Challenge) - If IHE will verify conformance rather than transaction, Face-to-face is needed. - This testing should be offered continuously - Even in this specific scenario here, direct interaction between content creators and consumers may be useful in case of errors or irregularities. 	4%

Single peer testing as a <i>source/initiator/client</i> in which a monitor may verify initiation and error processing.	
Remote only	32%
Face to Face only	21%
Remote and Face to Face	47%
Takeaway: Remote is clearly preferred (79%). But both still expected by 47%.	
Respondents that added a specific reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maybe both, but it depends on the details. - Remote, Face to Face, Available for any web service transaction 	2%

Single peer testing as a <i>receiver/server</i> in which a monitor must verify a transaction	
Remote only	27%
Face to Face only	28%
Remote and Face to Face	43%
Takeaway: Remote remains preferred (70%). Both expected by 43%.	
Respondents that added a specific reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maybe both, but it depends on the details. - Remote, Face to Face, Available for any web service transaction 	2%

Multiple peer (group) testing. Transactions among three or more actors (e.g. workflow). Initial source/initiator/client in which a monitor may verify initiation and error processing	
Remote only	14%
Face to Face only	51%
Remote and Face to Face	34%
Takeaway: Face to Face has a strong majority (85%). Remote drops at (48%). Both expected by 34%.	
<p>Respondents that added a specific reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maybe both, but it depends on the details. - Remote, Face to Face, Available for any web service transaction - Remote may be more challenging, but experience shows feasible) - Remote, Face to Face, doing this remote may need more time, coordination and communication. - Some of these tests could be performed remotely, but not all. - Remote, "hybrid" 	6%
Multiple peer (group) testing. Transactions among three or more actors (e.g. workflow). Intermediate and final receiver/server in which a monitor must verify a transaction	
Remote only	9%
Face to Face only	52%
Remote and Face to Face	37%
Takeaway: Face to Face only has a strong majority (90%). Remote drops at (46%). Both expected by 37%.	
<p>Respondents that added a specific reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of these tests could be performed remotely, but not all. - Remote, Face to Face, doing this remote may need more time, coordination and communication. - Remote, face to face "hybrid" - Remote, Face to Face, Available for any web service transaction 	3%

Based on your answer to the last question, what are your IHE Connectathon participation fee expectations?	
Lower	38%
Same	58%
Higher	4%
Takeaway: Same has a slight majority (58%). Lower is significant (38%). Both is expected by 37%. Analyze: justifying the price	
<p>Among those that responded <i>Lower</i>, comments were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I expect the fee to be lower as there are less costs for a remote event vs a face-to-face one. - Max. 1000 EUR/system, no person fee - lower costs for the f2f event - 2000 - Virtual events tend to be less expensive than presential. - Lower cost (no rooms, no meals, etc.) should reflect in fees. - network is the same; venue is "free"; - Since no venue with catering, extra power and network has to be rented, it should be a bit cheaper. Also, no flight and hotel costs. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Half of regular price. (If all events will be remotely) - If participation is remote, the value for the vendor is much less - Remote would involve less testing, less local resources (lunch, tables, etc) - the remote tests imply less physical attendance and thus smaller room and less logistics cost - Depending if we have to go to a face2face and a remote connectathon. If (to cover all tests) we would have to both, I would expect the connectathon face 2 face to be lower and the remote connectathon much lower. - Less costs for the remote testing (no location fees and so on). - By offering the possibility to execute no-peer tests and tests for content only remotely, the number of tests can be limited, possibly limiting the resources needed for the connectathon and with that, the costs. - Remote testing should incur less operation costs on IHE, thus we expect less fees to be paid for participating in Connectathon - The purpose of Connectathon is beyond the testing itself. So remote Connectathon should be much cheaper than Face-to-Face one. - Remote only participation - lower cost as a venue is not required - Logistics cost should get reduced with remote connectathon - Budgets are impacted this year due to COVID-19, so we may not be able to participate with travel if the costs are high. - Because majority of logistics and IT needs including setups can be reduced drastically. - Having a remote testing session remotely should be cheaper because there are not costs for travel/accommodation for the IHE folks - We do not need to rent a big facility and supply, only virtual machines in the same cloud. - Less tests will be executed during a testing session, and less expensive organization. - I expect a remote Connectathon to be cheaper, because the cost for the venue, catering, etc should be lower. - Fees reduction of 50 % to the IHE members accredited - Number of participants will be lower with remote option, so no need to manage local infrastructure for so many people. From participant point of view: remote collaboration with other peer is never as effective than face to face collaboration. - No need for booking an event location will reduce cost. - no venue and site expenses - no accommodation - If all remote, then no need for fees for food, rooms, on-site infrastructure, etc. - If Remote connectathon cost is too high, there is the risk that vendors have to make a choice (or remote or face to face but not both). As a consequence, the attendance to the face to face connectathon will not be high enough to be sustainable. So eventually it will kill the face to face connectathon - if the whole event is carried out remotely, there is no need for physical place - In case of remote IHE Connectathon the fee expectation must be lower because we would lose all the advantages, we had attending the f2f event. - less than 3000 euros - With F2F you have more support - Since most participants will be utilizing thier own infrastructure this exceptional year fees can be lowered. - Lower fees for remote participation. Same if F2F participation. - Less logistics expenses 	
<p>Among those that responded <i>Same</i>, comments were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AFAIK, IHE is a non-profit organization. - Connectathon fees are financing Gazelle developments - Saving F2F costs should be used for setup/support of remote tooling 	

- Fee should be lower for remote CAT but the same for face to face CAT.
- As stated earlier, no expectations. Lets get into this, gain experience and push it to a new level.
- Irrespective of supporting for remote Connectathon, I've selected answer as Same since I do not consider undermining IHE's efforts in organising a remote event even if other costs are actually excluded in remote event like power, internet, food, venue rentals etc.
- As this was handled by our team assistance, I have no idea what my company paid for.
- no change to current face to face procedure, thus no change to fees
- For a face to face participation, fee must be the same because nothing really changes with last years.
- Remote testing produces some cost saving for participant, this is enough if testing process consistency and rigour can be guaranteed from IHE
- I don't handle the invoices
- Keeping the most difficult tests (with high level of interactions needed) as face-to-face test, maybe during a shorter amount of days, and having the possibility to perform tests with a low level of interaction remotely (during another time-frame maybe), could keep the costs low
- Usual
- I expect a smaller group of people on site, but therefore more advanced remote network for remote access
- The fee should stay the same because no catering is needed for remote participants but a dedicated conference software is needed.
- On the long-term costs of the necessary IT infrastructure for a remote CAT should roughly be similar to the renting of the local for the F2F event
- Bigger technical Effort may be compensated with less Accommodation
- For an on-site participant, there should be similar expected value as for F2F-only connectathons. Having remote participants would cause less expenses for IHE in venue size/catering/physical infrastructure, which is offset by more expenses for enabling the network infrastructure to allow remote participation.
- If there is only remote Connectathon, costs for staff and technics might be the same but there are no additional costs for the location.
- Same
- I don't think it should be higher as there is no need to have etc. a venue, people travelling and food.
- Ultrasound has been covered under the Siemens participants umbrella
- As the efforts organizing a combined F2F and remote Connectathon I see not much difference in the fee expectations
- Ask for a test fee per year and let us do remote testing on all scheduled connectathon. As there is always a lack of tes partners for specific tests, we can fill up these slots from remote and over the year we find enough partners. In addition why turn of the equipment during the year ?
- flat budget ensures large participation
- same organisation as usual
- no change for the local organization; need of monitors, infrastructure, ...
- The resource-amount is the same if it is face-2-face or remote; you have to provide the infrastructure, and probably pay for the monitors. Probably the room can be cancelled; but even if a remote-connectathon somebody has to take care on the infrastructure
- Higher efforts due to more complex test infrastructure and coordination compared to lower demands for needed space as fewer f2f participants
- available resource can be put into implementing remote testing infrastructure
- As a monitor I do no pay.
- The effort is the same (travel excluded)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The same technical setup and expertise required. People will already save from not travelling. - an increase could discourage participation - It should be same. - The fee would remain the same if a mix of face to face and remote testing. - If remote access is a workaround to face to face, price shall be unchanged. - I Think connectathon is a great opportunity to Know other parteners to test interoperability - Nothing to add. Such remote test and cross check is time consuming, less efficient and will probably degrade the efficiency of the Connectathon." - This will require additional coordination support and monitor verification. Tooling will have to be enhanced (proxy validators). - It could be the same or a bit lower due to lack of some services - Putting in place remote tests will have a cost I'm sure. But in the end, it may mean that less person will be present F2F (participant and IHE people) with reduced cost of location rent and associated cost. But I'm not sure as I really don't know all the costs of an IHE Connectathon. - same. IHE needs funds to develop test tools. - "Some tests usually work out better with f2f exchanges. - However, I am convinced remote testing is key to enable broader testing groups. It demands a certain infrastructure that will first need to be developed and maintained in order to set standards that could be used also outside of connectathons (or like connectathons ""throughout the year""). I personally see potential in that approach." - "Less people will show up. Less food needed, less electricity used. --> Lower fees - But more work will be needed in creating extra platforms that would ease comunication, coordination, support and verification. --> Higher fees - One may then say: With IHE Connectathon being delayed, IHE lost some money. But keep in mind that not only IHE Connectathon, but all companies that will participate may have been financially affected by COVID 19, so that wouldn't be a good reason to increase fees. --> Same fees - Taking all these factors into consideration, the fees should remain the same." - These fee-related questions are N/A for me - Infrastructure, monitor and services are the same (if no days reduction) - Interoperability testing tests offered remotely should be equivalent to face-to-face ones. - I think the expenses are equivalent - same because I would still prefer to attend the face to face event. remote users should pay the fee for the additional remote test capabilities. - only transportation and accommodation fees will be avoided in remote testing, but extra cost will be introduced in preparing environment for remote testing - same as for an in-person event - Although the CAT fees are already high they are still reasonable if all the effort is considered to organize the whole event. But introducing a remote version for some tests shouldn't increase the fee, especially for companies which will be present at the venue and are not using the remote possibilities. - Cost doesn't matter to me. 	
<p>Among those that responded <i>Higher</i>, comments were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more infrastructure, planning needed - To be "Higher", fare verification process and also somewhat conformance should be provided. - 250 Euro - Offering "face-to-face" and "remote" services must increase the fees. 	

Should an IHE-provided reference implementation/simulator be substituted or used to complement peer testing?	
Yes, a reference implementation / simulator should be available, but only if there is not enough peers for testing	59%
No, a reference implementation / simulator is not sufficient	11%
Yes, a reference implementation / simulator is sufficient	23%
Takeaway: Having both is largely supported 66%. But still 23% think it is sufficient.	
Respondents that provided other answers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, available in parallel at all times; sufficient for single-sided checks, but not when P2P matters - The answer to this question varies by profile/actor & tool. - Yes, a reference implementation /simulator should be available in addition to peer testing and should be counted when there is not enough peers for testing. - A reference implementation if possible, should be ADDITIONAL to peer implementations - A reference implementation is always helpful, sometimes sufficient, but it's preferable to also have real peers - both should be available and both should be used for testing - Both, at all times, simulator as a baseline, peers as level2+ 	7%

Anticipated logistics and scheduling modifications for a successful remote connectathon outcome should include:	
Require a common platform that enables screen sharing on tested systems (e.g. for monitor evaluation),	79%
Require a common platform that enables audio among participants and monitors,	73%
Establish a schedule to interact with monitors,	70%
Establish a schedule to test with peers	67%
Multiple virtual meeting rooms to support, simultaneous 1 on 1 discussions,	59%
Require a common platform that enables video among participants and monitors	57%
Maintain current schedule 9-5:30 for a remote Connectathon	50%
Hold face-to-face event for certain types of testing, and hold a remote for other types of testing,	43%
Reduced daily duration and extend the number of days to accommodate time zones for a remote Connectathon,	42%
Takeaway: Common Platform of Screen sharing and audio largely expected by about 75%. Established schedule to interact with monitors and peers expected (69%). A majority (58%) expects video and virtual meeting rooms to interact among participants. No clear consensus on allocating time for the remote testing event (same as today or reduced each day but across more days, etc.) Analyze: Get specific feedback from Monitor	
Additional Input by respondents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to accommodate multiple time zones - EU, NA, APAC - Evaluate https://jitsi.org/jitsi-meet/ (running on own servers) - I like https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jitsi - a platform (video and audio) could be given as "sponsoring") by the industry - I opt for a face to face Connectathon - Perform a remote Connectathon at the business time (9:00-5:30) of each country. - Participants time zone should not matter - Established schedules can be helpful but communication shall also be possible on demand outside 	10%

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Think out of the box why can't I do 24 hour testing during the event? If monitors are also from remote - they can look into test cases during their time zone! - Organize smaller, test "tracks" (i.e. by profile) as the recent FHIR connectathon. Assign a volunteer track leader to coordinate logistics and help ensure profile coverage. Each track can utilize their own preferred method of communication, chat should be sufficient, with daily "zoom" check-ins. Monitors can check results remotely and reach out to Participants by chat. This does not need to be facilitated with a single monolithic test platform. FHIR connectathon utilized several validators, google sheets, zulip chat. Because a single test framework was not relied upon, there was an inherent load-balancing of test resources. - Video is nice to get to know your peers, but not mandatory in my opinion. 	
--	--

What roadblocks would keep you from participating in a connectathon remotely?	
Poor communication quality would prohibit my remote participation	44%
My day to day activities are too much of a distraction	42%
Managing multiple simultaneous discussions in several virtual meeting rooms is too difficult	39%
Corporate firewall limits necessary ports and protocols for testing would prohibit my remote participation	38%
Language barriers make remote communication more difficult	25%
Configuring my system(s) to work with a VPN or screen sharing software would prohibit my remote participation	23%
My system(s) require large file transfers, prohibiting remote participation	11%
<p>Takeaway: Four significant barriers at about 40%: Poor communication quality, my day to day activities, managing multiple simultaneous discussions in several virtual meeting rooms, corporate firewall limits would prohibit my remote participation</p> <p>Lesser barriers at 24%: Language (Analyse: will a written chat help?) and VPN set-up.</p> <p>Several (10%) took the time to share that they see no roadblocks.</p>	
<p>Other roadblocks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not enough experience to give an answer - no roadblocks - no roadblocks for me - None - I do not see a roadblock - how tendentious is this "REQUIRED" question ? - Consider an increase in frequency of smaller remote connectathons for web services - inefficient scheduling tools - I do not see any roadblocks for a remote Connectathon. - Let's get into this, don't expect too much, gain experience and work on breaking down the roadblocks - Technical roadblocks are not an issue, it's rather the format itself with the tight exchange on stage that I'd see as an obstacle - Need enough lead time to connect my systems to the internet (VPN) - Above points may effectively each one impact the success of the participation but can be to a large scale anticipated. - Remote testing could be a challenge for the tests that require 3 or more test partners - Some of the dev teams are not in the same time zone - Worth trying a remote connectathon - Personal discussion is one of the most important benefits - Distant interactions are cold - To overcome the corporate proxy barrier, putting a system as a VM in cloud may not be always possible. 	16%

Respondents provided additional comments or feedback:	26%
<p>Takeaway: ~40% are expecting a remote connectathon, ~30% are expressing serious concerns, ~30% are unsure, but trusting IHE to do the best possible.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please make this happen! • None. Looking forward to a remote event. • The main advantage of Connectathons is not the testing or the test results. It's the people that explain why a test is failing, the historical background, the rationale behind it that makes the event valuable. • Remote testing reduces the time spent running around in the big hall, there is are also less distraction by other people, background noise. • The testing platform must have an integrated video conference system to reduce the time spent on finding the right people to add to the conference • I would do this as two separate events. First the remote testing event, and maybe two, three weeks later the face2face event. • My opinion, online activity is against the nature of the Connectathon event. Yes, travel, accommodation, participation fee and similar expenses are very high, but I would prefer a face-to-face effectiveness. I had very useful experiences from the events I attended face to face. Even for the setting of a medical device, we cannot get along with the technician on the field remotely. I'm not sure how the Connectathon event can be done remotely 😊 • From RSNA headquarters park garage to Autoworld – something went wrong! We should have switched to pure remotely testing already 10 years ago! • Why not initiating a permanent testing platform, not limited to a one week event. • Why limiting to Europe. I see no technical reason for splitting testing according geographical or political world regions. • Best world be probably if for a given company systems under test could be remote and a limited number of participants on site and the rest remote. • Remote testing could be an idea to make some tests but it cannot replace the F2F event. If the participation fees will be similar to the face to face event I don't think there will be so much interest in it. The F2F event is a wonderful experience for the people and I think it is seen by them as a "reward". Doing it remotely I think it will become a normal job activity. • It is very good to see that you evaluating remote possibility. • I did this survey because not applying is like giving up before a discussion. This survey is tendentious. I cannot emphasize the depth of my disappointment. All of us doing business have to keep up with customer demands. We tweek and rethink business processes to survive. We may not like it but we need to put effort behind our change processes. We try to find chances when we do this. Your questions in the survey show that you did not even think about the huge chance to offer a better experience by an extended remote service but only try to defend your current situation. • Don't forget the support for less experienced monitors • Suggestion to have a pilot trial for some tests with selected vendors and get the input lessons learned from this experiment • We should anticipate the mindset changes brought up by Corona and really try to avoid unnecessary travelling by making optimal use of existing communication and connectivity techniques • Remote/on-site testing each has advantages/disadvantages. While my colleagues and me prefer on-site testing, a remote option would benefit others for their own reason. • Removing the face to face connectathon will have a negativ impact on the IHE community. One of the core principles, why IHE is so successful in my option is the interactions between the vendors and the discussions around it. this will hardly happen in remote events. 	

- Just to repeat, I'm a monitor and not a vendor. I strongly believe IHE should invest in remote testing so that any vendor or monitor can participate if travel is not possible. I will not travel in 2020. --Bill Majurski/NIST
- If we are unable to travel to meet face-to-face, then it may be good to postpone until next year to continue. Everyone gets a bye year for this year.
- Deploying vendors machines to a public cloud on the same network would allow same experience. In addition, performance is a big value for customers. Shipping performing hardware is expensive so everybody just brought its product on low performing machines and we could not test performance on connectathon events. Renting a performing hardware at a public cloud for a week would not be a big deal.
- For every profile, connect-A-thon test cases should be classified as Remote and Local. We can push as much as test cases as marked remote to pre-requisite. Based on pre-requisite + local test performance certification can be generated. Idea here is to move lot of test cases for each profile to pre-requisite to reduce interaction & ease of execution.
- I see the added value of a F2F event, but if COVID-19 is still a problem in November, then a remote event is preferred, even though we understand it will be a challenge to organize it.
- Face to face is the more efficient way to reach the expected outcome. The COVID risk must be overcome with a balance of space and cleaning room. Including a disclaimer to avoid future claims of infecting.
- We applaud IHE for considering this option and hope that this becomes a reality!
- Thank you for soliciting this feedback from participants. It is important input. IHE technical leadership should already be proactively preparing for remote testing. Significant analysis needs to be done to determine what can reasonably be done without being in the same room. This applies to technical considerations, process, use of monitors, and assessment of existing test definitions, etc. Pre-Connectathon tests and no-peer Connectathon tests are obvious candidates to be performed remotely and evaluated remotely. For example, TPMs could ensure that all pre-Connectathon tests become no-peer Connectathon tests. This is already the case for many but not all). Then, these would become a formal part of Connectathon testing that would be performed remotely (in advance of connectathon week) and evaluated by monitors remotely (in advance of Connectathon week). Many profiles with 2 or 3 actors (eg PDQ*, WIA), or two-peer tests in more complex profiles might reasonably be tested remotely. TPMs could identify reasonable changes to tools that would ease remote testing. TPMs could spend summer months doing this analysis and preparation for remote testing of some profiles (that might occur in Nov 2020, or for future Connectathons). I have not been asked to do anything, and I don't know what we are waiting for.
- Based on the COVID situation I would like to participate remotely.
- Thanks for the work you are putting in organizing this event and for the effort in trying to do what it's best for everybody!
- I hope you are good in health.