



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**

Information Society and Media Directorate-General

Converged Networks and Services / Emerging Technologies & Infrastructures

Brussels,  
D(2009)

**Subject: Minutes Future Internet Caretakers meeting - 26<sup>th</sup> June 2009, Brussels**

Participants: See annex 1

**1. FUTURE INTERNET – DRAFT REPORT FROM THE TASK FORCE ON CONTENT**

In advance of the meeting, a draft version of the report was distributed to the caretakers.

Thomas Skordas introduces the topic by reminding the process carried out so far and that lead to the current version of the report. He then walks through it and explains its current findings.

The groups present one-by-one their views on the draft report. The report was considered to be going into the right direction. The following comments were raised:

- The structure of the report seems to suggest layered research challenges; they sometimes missed the cross-cutting aspects.
- Networking perspective only present in networked resources.
- Deployment issues and lifecycle management not sufficiently addressed.
- How can we involve user communities in experimentation?
- How do we go about federating the F-O-T platforms? This needs to be included as a research topic under frameworks or governance.
- Engineering might be a good idea but there will be problems with the IPR's.
- Usage of the platform is important for federation. It differs to what kind of federation rules you use if the platforms are experimental, pre-commercial or commercial.
- Does F-O-T cover everything? Also scalability and atomicity? Will an F-O-T represent a community?
- Voice services are not so much mentioned.
- Titles of areas are difficult to understand

- Use more generic term for "trusted" (not sociopathic, sociable, usable)
- Experimentation for the community by the community; we need a good methodology for this.
- Engineering looks similar to what they call "adoption" in Nessi.
- User aspect should also be included in governance and policies.
- Platform is well defined but not always consistently used
- Experimental research is a methodology; this could be reflected more.

Several of the above issues have been clarified during the discussion, and others will be taken into consideration for the next version that will be put up for public consultation over the summer. On behalf of the Task Force, Mr. Skordas thanks every one for their contributions.

## 2. FUTURE INTERNET ASSEMBLY – QUESTIONNAIRES FROM CARETAKERS

In advance of the meeting, a questionnaire was circulated among the caretakers to collect their views on several aspects of their experience in FIA (see Annex for full questionnaire)

5 groups (RWI, FISO, FISE, TI, FCN) returned a questionnaire in advance of the meeting. The 2 other groups (MANA, FIRE) did not return a questionnaire but could verbally present their findings.

The 6 groups' representatives walked the audience through their respective findings, some subject to a brief exchange in between participants. Overall the comments are very positive and there is a consensus that the FIA process should continue. Among the positive aspects, caretakers highlight:

- The **momentum** created by the community around the events which, in addition to the sessions, offer a **very good networking** activity.
- The fact that all groups have **plans towards upcoming FIAs**.

Some recurring areas of concern/improvement include:

- The difficulty to motivate people to **actively participate** in the process.
- The difficulty to achieve **effective cross-domain** work.
- The consequences of having **parallel sessions** in FIAs.

Mr Da Silva comments on some of the presented elements:

- On having a **Coordinaton Action** as part of call 4/5 to support the work of FIA, he suggests that the idea is appealing.

- On including participation of call 4/5 projects in FIA in their **description of work and subsequently reviewing the quality of the contributions to the FIA during the project review**, he supports the idea.
- On integrating '**application' aspects** in FIA, he argues that the management of FIA is already quite complex with about ~130 projects and suggests that the discussions about the PPP will be a better environment to integrate them.
- On expanding the time allocated to **Socio-Economics** topics in upcoming FIAs, he argues that due to its cross-domain nature, it would be better to promote it to the plenary session.
- On inviting/involving **national initiatives** in upcoming FIAs, he fully supports the idea.
- On inviting/involving **international initiatives** in upcoming FIAs, he overall supports the idea but under the condition that it includes an active involvement of the participants. Sometimes there are already other dedicated events for international collaboration, like the EU-Japan conference on the Future Internet.
- On using time before/after FIAs to **hold side events**, he fully supports the idea and reminds that this has already been done in previous FIAs.

### 3. FUTURE INTERNET ASSEMBLY – STOCKHOLM DRAFT AGENDA

With a view to addressing the concerns highlighted in the previous discussion, the EC makes a proposal to re-arrange the breakout sessions of Stockholm the following way:

- **Maintain the overall length** of breakouts from Madrid and Prague, i.e. ~ 8 hours. (This comes in addition to the ~4hours of plenary).
- **Maintain the parallelism** of sessions.
- **Maintain individual group meetings** but reduce their length (from 4h to 2h) and hold them all in parallel towards the end. Maintaining them will allow each group to keep the existing momentum, to debrief the other breakout sessions and to progress on their own respective work.
- Use the freed time to organise 9 sessions (3 times 3 sessions of 2 hours) dedicated to **cross-domain specific topics**.

The specific topics session would have the following ambition:

- Address **one specific topic** in one single session. Topics can require follow-up but the goal is to avoid creating new recurring sessions.
- **Avoid duplication** of topics across separate groups.
- Topics would be **prepared in advance** by the Community, debated on site and concluded through a rapporteur-type of report.

The proposal is debated among caretakers and, pending some open organisational points for which the Commission will formulate a proposal, the concept is approved.

The caretakers then debate and decide of the nine (draft) topics that will be addressed in Stockholm. In addition, a preliminary assignment of the caretakers to each topic is made.

These are:

(1) ***Different architectures for different business models***

Alex Galis, John Domingue, Markus Brunner, Norbert Niebert, Pierre-Yves Danet, Stefano de Panfilis, Theodore Zahariadis

(2) ***ID Management, routing and addressing in the Future Internet***

Alex Gluhak, Jim Clarke, Michel Riguidel, Norbert Niebert, Pierre-Yves Danet, Tasos Gavras, Theodore Zahariadis

(3) ***What does it mean to conduct experimentally-driven research?***

Tasos Gavras

(4) ***Deploying on “Future Internet Research & Experimentation” (FIRE)***

Alex Gluhak, John Domingue, Nick Wainwright, Pierre-Yves Danet, Tasos Gavras, Theodore Zahariadis

(5) ***Orchestration across things, services and content***

Alex Galis, Alex Gluhak, John Domingue, Stefano de Panfilis, Theodore Zahariadis

(6) ***The question of ‘Discovery & Search’ in the future Internet***

John Domingue, Michel Riguidel, Petros Daros, Pierre-Yves Danet, Tasos Gavras, Theodore Zahariadis

(7) ***What does Future Internet mean for smart-cities?***

John Domingue, Nick Wainwright, Stefano de Panfilis, Tasos Gavras

(8) ***How to measure trust?***

Markus Brunner, Michel Riguidel, Norbert Niebert, Pierre-Yves Danet, Theodore Zahariadis, Volkmar Lotz

(9) ***What does Future Internet mean for enterprise?***

Alex Gluhak, John Domingue, Neeli Prasad, Stefan Haller, Stefano de Panfilis

The EC will propose a modus operandi on how to bring these topics to Stockholm. This is presented in the file "Stockholm – Modus Operandi for Breakout Sessions – 1<sup>st</sup> July 2009". Please read this file carefully, it contains the actions to prepare for Stockholm.

#### 4. FUTURE INTERNET BOOK

Mr. Tasos Gavras presents the future book. It is proposed that in Valencia a second book will be presented in the FIA book series. The proposed title is "Towards the Future Internet - Emerging Trends from European Research". A draft CFP is ready and agreed among the editorial board.

The selection process will be in stages to combine the results of a peer review process and the opinion of the FIA constituency.

The first selection will be based on peer reviewed extended abstracts (4 pages). The best contributions will be invited to present their paper at poster sessions during the 4th FIA event in Stockholm

At the poster sessions the FIA constituency will be invited to express its opinion on the contributions. This will be the basis to invite the best contributions for the development of full papers.

At the Future Internet Conference in Valencia, the best contribution(s) will be presented with an award.

It was discussed that the poster session in Stockholm requires to have its proper time allocated -more than 1/2h during the coffee breaks- particularly if we wish to use it as an evaluation stage and ask people to present and others to see those posters.

Timetable:

- |   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| - Extended abstract submission deadline | September 30, 2009      |
| - Poster acceptance notification        | November 2, 2009        |
| - Poster sessions at FIA Stockholm      | November, 23 - 24, 2009 |
| - Invitation for full papers            | December 4, 2009        |
| - Camera ready copy for full papers     | January 22, 2010        |

Editors:

Georgios Tselentis (chair), European Commission

Alex Galis, University College London

Anastasius Gavras, Eurescom

Burkhard Stiller, University of Zurich

Srdjan Krco, Ericsson

Volkmar Lotz, SAP

Elena Simperl, STI Innsbruck

Theodore Zahariadis, Synelixis

## 5. ACTIONS

FIA Caretakers:

- (1) Review Modus Operandi for Breakout Sessions
- (2) Finalise title of topics, topic leaders and first draft of problem statement by 31 July
- (3) Put the topics on-line on future-internet.eu by 18th September (FIA-caretakers meeting in Brussels)
- (4) Assign a rapporteur to each topic (18 September)

EC:

- (5) Review recommendation to include participation to the FIA in the Description of Work of projects coming out of Call 4 and 5, making it also possible to review their contributions to the FIA during the annual review of the project.
- (6) Develop a time schedule for the break out sessions in Stockholm by 18 September. Include time for poster sessions for the FIA book.
- (7) End of September: Opening of registrations for Stockholm; participants are asked which session they intend to participate and are will be added to the distribution lists of each topic

Next FIA Caretakers meeting:

18 September in Brussels 11.30 – 16.00 h.

16 October in Brussels 11.30 – 16.00 h (if necessary in view of the preparation for Stockholm)

**6. ANNEX 1 – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

MANA	Markus Brunner
FISO	John Domingue, Stefano de Panfilis
FISE	Not represented
TI	Represented by Yves Paindaveine (EC)
RWI	Alex Gluhak
FIRE	Tasos Gavras
FCN	Theodore Zahariadis, Norbert Niebert
Content Task Force Experts	Gonzalo Camarillo, Jacques Magen, Sachar Paulus
European Commission	João da Silva, Mario Campolargo  Franco Accordino, Bernard Barani, Peter Fatelnig, Miguel Montarelo, Peter Stuckmann, Isidro Laso, Sandro D'Elia, Anne-Marie Sassen, Manuel Mateo, Juan Santaella, Georgios Tselentis, Yves Paindaveine, Thomas Skordas

## **7. ANNEX 2 – QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE FIA CARETAKERS**

The purpose of this questionnaire is the following: after the organisation of 3 FIA events (Bled, Madrid and Prague), we would like to further value your work, capitalise on the experiences gained and further build on the successes achieved so far so that we can, with your help, re-structure the agenda and contents of the next two FIA events (Stockholm and Valencia) to best meet the expectations and ambitious objectives we have set with regard to the Future Internet.

### **(1) Self-assessment and evolution of FIA groups:**

Q1.1 How do you assess the performance and results achieved by your group after 3 FIA events?

Q1.2 How do you see the evolution of your group in the coming months / year(s)?  
In particular,

Q1.3 With which other groups would you see that your cooperation needs to be strengthened and how to achieve it?

Q1.4 Similarly, with which other groups do you consider that your cooperation was not fruitful enough so far? Should it and how could it be improved?

Q1.5 How would you deal with the integration of new ICT research projects from Call 4?

### **(2) Further structuring the FIA groups:**

Q2.1 Should we continue with the same number and structure of FIA groups for FIA Stockholm and FIA Valencia?

If yes: how could we further strengthen the cross-cooperation among the FIA groups and in particular, among which groups, while at the same time not losing the dynamics of single area groups?

If no: which sort of new composition of FIA groups would you suggest? (Note: emphasis should be maintained on inter-disciplinary cooperation)

### **(3) Evolution of FIA caretakers:**

Q3.1 What is your experience in working with your respective communities?

Q3.2 How do you see your own role? How is this role perceived by the projects of your group?

Q3.3 Should there be rotation of the FIA Caretakers? If yes, every when?

### **(4) Evolution of FIA events:**

Q4.1 How do you see the evolution of the FIA events in the future? Should they be maintained and if yes, should they evolve and in which direction?

Q4.2 What about their duration? Is the actual duration of events OK or should they become longer or shorter? In particular:

Q4.3 Should the Programmes comprise more plenary sessions? Should there be parallel sessions and what would there be the optimal number? Should there be technical sessions presenting scientific results? Other suggestions?

Q4.4 Should the Programmes also include sessions of cooperation with national initiatives on the FI?

Q4.5 Should they include an international cooperation dimension [i.e. specific sessions with other FI initiatives of the world]?