Problem Motivation: Did the speaker motivate this problem? Why is the problem interesting? What applications can this problem be applied to? List at least two applications this problem can be applied to other than what was presented. Briefly justify your answer. (50 word limit)

There are a number of recent developments which motivate this problem. HTML5 now allows for geolocation and there is wide browser support for HTML5. Solving this problem can help reduce internet fraud and hacking attacks.

Problem Statement: What problem did the presenter attempt to solve? If applicable, what were the input, output, objective, and constraints for this problem? Briefly justify your answer. (50 word limit)

The problem they solved is improving the password authentication process with the help of spatial computing. One way to think about the inputs and outputs is that inputs are login credentials and geographic location and the output is access or denial of access. A primary constraint is security.

Hardness: What is the main challenge in this work? Classify these challenges into computational, spatial, other, etc. Briefly justify your answer. (50 word limit)

A computational challenge is working with KML. It is difficult, as there are limited functions and these are hard to edit. In addition, KmlLayer can’t be changed after rendering and coordinates cannot be obtained from it.

Proposed Solution: How did the presenter solve the problem that was described? What were the key ideas behind the proposed solution? What was innovative about their solution? List at least three suggestions on how their proposed solution may be improved. Briefly justify your answer. (50 word limit)

At a high level, they are solving this problem by adding geo-location to the traditional password/username authentication process. The extract buildings usingjquery and use this as google maps polygons, which allows for more freedom and tools including point in polygon. A database was used to store login credentials.
Related Work: Did the speaker provide a sufficient survey of related work? What were the main limitations in the related work? Do you feel that either the problem or proposed approach is novel? Briefly justify your answer. (50 word limit)

A related work is a paper by our TA, Mike Evans about localizing the internet. This group went about implementing a solution to one of the challenges presented in this work.

Validation: What were the validation methodologies used in this work? Was the proposed approach compared with any state-of-the-art or naive approaches? Were there any surprises in the validation results relative to your expectations? Briefly justify your answer. (50 word limit)

For validation, they visited buildings around the UMN campus and attempted to log in to their service. They conducted this type of test multiple times at multiple locations, including several different spots within particular buildings.

Presentation Critique:

Do you think the speaker did a good job motivating and defining the problem clearly for someone like you who may be a "non-expert" on the topic? Why or why not? (50 word limit)

Yes, they did a very good job of clearly defining the task at hand. In addition they provided compelling reasons for the interest in this problem as well as their proposed solution.

Did the speaker emphasize the central message (e.g. did they follow: "Tell the audience what you're going to say, say it; then tell them what you've said.") (50 word limit)

Yes, they presented an outline to begin the talk, stayed on topic. They did not do a lot in the way of "tell them what you said", though most other groups did not either. This is definitely related to the time limit.

Did the speaker relate to the audience? What did the speaker do to establish a rapport with the audience before delivering the key message? (50 word limit)
Yes, they introduced themselves and perhaps could have had more questions early on in the presentation.

What did the speaker do to engage the audience? e.g. Did the speaker ask short questions to either motivate the upcoming topic or assess the background/thinking of the audience? (50 word limit)

The speakers engaged the audience with a good introduction to the topic, a interesting validation methodology (by using the very buildings we use daily), and a clear flowchart indicating the parts of the solution.

Did you understand most of the talk (or 75%, 50%, 25%, 5%, 0%)? Did the speaker inspire you to want to learn more about what he/she is doing? If you had to rate the presentation check-, check or check+, what score would you give? Briefly justify your answer. (50 word limit)

I understood most of the talk, probably about 90-95%. They piqued my interest and inspired me to look into this topic. In addition, they provided a link to their code. I would rate this presentation a check+.