Graphics Hardware 2000

Best Paper Award and Workshop Evaluation Form

1 Best Paper Award

Please check the paper which you think was the best paper presented at the workshop, regarding scientific value, originality and quality of presentation. This ballot is completely anonymous.
Check only one box!

- ❑ "Algorithms for Division Free Perspective Correct Rendering" B. Barenburg, F.J. Peters, C.W. van Overveld, Philips Research Laboratories
- ❑ "Tiled Polygon Traversal Using Half-Plane Edge Functions" J. McCormack, R. McNamara, Compaq Computer Corproration
- ❑ "Polygon Rendering on a Stream Architecture" J. D. Owens, W. J. Dally, U. J. Kapasi, S. Rixner, P. Mattson, B. Mowery, Stanford University
- ❑ "Hardware-Accelerated Free-Form Deformation", C. Chua, U. Neumann, University of Southern California
- ❑ "Towards hardware implementation of Loop subdivision" S. Bischoff, L. Kobbelt, H.P. Seidel, Max-Planck-Institute for Computer Sciences
- ❑ "Towards Interactive Bump Mapping with Anisotropic Shift-Variant BRDFs" J. Kautz, H.P. Seidel, Max-Planck-Institute for Computer Sciences
- ❑ "Adaptive View Dependent Tessellation of Displacement Maps"M. Doggett, J. Hirche, University of Tubingen
- ❑ "Single-Pass Full-Screen Hardware Accelerated Antialiasing" J. A. Lee, L. S. Kim, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology
- ❑ "Prefiltered Antialiased Lines Using Half-Plane Distance Functions" R, McNamara, J. McCormack, N.P. Jouppi, Compaq Computer Corporation
- ❑ "Tracking Graphics State for Networked Rendering" I. Buck, G. Humphreys, P. Hanrahan, Stanford University
- ❑ "Hybrid Sort-First and Sort-Last Parallel Rendering with a Cluster of PCs" R. Samanta, T. Funkhouser, K. Li, J. P. Singh, Princeton University
- ❑ "Interactive Volume Rendering on Standard PC Graphics Hardware Using Multi-Textures and Multi-Stage Rasterization" C. R. Salama, K. Engel, M. Bauer, G. Greiner, T. Ertl, Univ Erlangen/Stuttgart
- ❑ "GI-Cube: An Architecture for Volumetric Global Illumination and Rendering" F. Dachille, A. Kaufman, SUNY Stony Brook
- ❑ "Optimizing Ray Casting Performance With A Small-Scale Architecture" H. Ray, D. Silver, Rutgers Universityl

2 Workshop Evaluation

Please take a few minutes to fill out this form, which will be used for making important decisions about future workshops. This survey is completely anonymous. The results of this survey will be made public on the workshop web page at http://www.merl.com/hwws00

2.1 Please rate the overall value of the workshop on a scale from 0 (no value, waste of time and money) to 5 (high value, excellent event)

Your rating: ____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

2.2 What would increase the value of the workshop for you (check all that applies)

- ☐ Keep it as it is
- ☐ Distribute the proceedings on CDROM
- ☐ Accept more papers, such as implementation reports, technology presentations, to attract more participants
- ☐ Extend the scope of the workshop, e.g., towards multimedia-applications, video processing, audio processing, general DSP applications, entertainment systems, game chips, set top systems...

Comments: _____

_____

_____

2.3 Do you think Hot 3D is a valuable addition to the workshop?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Maybe, but...

Comments: _____

_____

2.4 Where should the workshop be held in future years?

☐ Always in Europe ☐ Always in the U.S. ☐ Alternate between Europe and U.S.

Comments: _____

_____

2.5 Please rate the following aspects of this year's workshop:

Overall organization: ☐ Awful ☐ Poor ☐ Just acceptable ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

Paper quality: ☐ Awful ☐ Poor ☐ Just acceptable ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

Proceedings: ☐ Awful ☐ Poor ☐ Just acceptable ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

Publicity: ☐ Awful ☐ Poor ☐ Just acceptable ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

Web page: ☐ Awful ☐ Poor ☐ Just acceptable ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

Workshop Venue: ☐ Awful ☐ Poor ☐ Just acceptable ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

Audio/Video: ☐ Awful ☐ Poor ☐ Just acceptable ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

Review Process: ☐ Awful ☐ Poor ☐ Just acceptable ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

Lunches: ☐ Awful ☐ Poor ☐ Just acceptable ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

Coffee Breaks: ☐ Awful ☐ Poor ☐ Just acceptable ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

Banquet: ☐ Awful ☐ Poor ☐ Just acceptable ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Excellent

Comments: _____

_____

Any other comments you may have: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____