

# OASC IoT LSP Weekly

## 1. Meeting Information

Date/time of the Meeting:	March 16th, 2016, 10:00-11:00 CET
Name of the meeting:	OASC IoT LSP Weekly
Place of the meeting:	GoTo Meeting
Phone details (if online):	<a href="https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/156586477">https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/156586477</a>

## 2. Attendees

Please unmark your name (remove yellow highlight) in the table below if you have attended the meeting.

Name	Organization	Attendance (N/A)
Martin Brynskov (Chairman)	Aarhus	x
Pentti Launonen	Aalto	x
Petra Turkama	Aalto	x
Mikko Riepula	Aalto	x
Antti Nurminen	Aalto	x
Hugo Goncalves / Roope Ritvos	Forum Virium Helsinki	x

Margarida Campolargo	Porto	x
Paulo Calcada	Porto	x
Irene	Digital Catapult	x
Alex Gluhak	Digital Catapult	x
Clara Pezuela	Atos	x
Adrian Slatcher	Manchester	x
Nadia Echchihab	FCC	x
Luis Munoz	Unican	x
David Gómez	Unican	x
Jarmo Eskelinen	Forum Virium	x
Davor Meersman	iMinds	x
Juanjo Hierro	FIWARE / Telefónica I+D	x
Sergio García	FIWARE / Telefónica I+D	x
Stefano De Panfilis	Engineering	x
Lanfranco Marasso	Engineering	x
Mirko Presser	Alexandra Institute	x
Bram Lievens	iMinds	x
Bart Braem	iMinds	x
Martino Maggio	Engineering	X

Marco Alessi	Engineering	x
Nuria de Lama	Atos	x
Sebastien Ziegler	Mandat International	x
Srdjan Krco	DunavNET	x
Laurent Horvath	City of Carouge	x
René Bartels	City of Eindhoven	x
Arthur Noordhoek	City of Eindhoven	x
Remco Muijs	Philips Lighting	x

Internal workspace: [gDocs](#)

### 3. Agenda

1. Opening & roll call
2. Approval of agenda
3. Status of proposal writing progress (refer to the [plan/timeline](#)).

#### 1 Excellence

##### 1.1 Objectives

##### 1.2 Relation to the Work Programme

##### 1.3 Concept and Approach

##### 1.4 Description of Each Ref. Zone (as is)

- some more complete than others. (Manchester still missing?) Unifying & integration to be done...

##### 1.5 Ambition (to be)

- Takeaways from the ref. zones discussions/telco

#### 2 Impact

- further feedback from the ref. zones

#### 3 Implementation

- WP1...6 etc. goes in here, go through 1 by 1

- PM budgets

#### 4 Members of the consortium

- is the list final?
  - partner profiles
- 5 Ethics and security

4. Administrative/housekeeping (NDA..? commitments...? Name?)

5. Practicalities of and agenda/workplan for the London WS

6. AOB

## 4. Minutes

All participants co-create the minutes.

**AP** Action points are marked like this.

### 1. Opening

The Chairman opened the meeting at 10:05 pm CET. See attendees listed above.

### 2. Agenda

The agenda had been distributed beforehand.

### 3. Status/process of proposal writing

The discussion centred around reference zones.

References zones: contributions will be in several sections. Section 1 will include themes, Section 2 assets and impact and Section 4 an overall description of the reference zone as a partner. We need to see a matrix of use cases as an overview.

**AP** The reference zones to change “xs” with “E,D,C”. And also start describing very briefly “**IoT assets**” that support these applications/themes (3-4 lines). E.g. (from OrganiCity)

<b>UC, SmartSantander Platform</b>
City-scale IoT experimentation facility deployed in Santander is already supportive for scientific experimentation and principally to smart city service experimentation and provision. The platform is already integrating heterogeneous data streams originating from deployed wireless sensor network, city Open Data records and citizens smartphones (through participatory sensing). The platform integrates data plane and management plane components dealing with the complete experiment life-cycle. Pertaining to smart city service provision the platform is based on FI-WARE assets. The platform is currently supporting the provision of smart city services and it has been the basis for several experiments on IoT technologies and smart city applications ( <b>TRL 7</b> ).
The platform which is currently available will be further validated during OrganiCity project allowing tuning of the facility functionalities and increasing the platform critical mass as long as further services will be incorporated thus adding consumers as well as producers. In this sense, special emphasis will be put on extending crowdsourcing capacities of the platform. Moreover, the platform will benefit from the OrganiCity co-creation focus as it will enable a more holistic platform in which the available technological baseline will be complemented by making data available to different communities thus encouraging and facilitating service co-creation mixing also social media streams. Additionally, we will contribute to the design of tools which guarantee to include in the experimentation platform the concept of opportunistic communications for data collection. After completion of OrganiCity, the platform is expected to reach <b>TRL 8</b> .

We can then use the E,D,C as indicating the maturity of city developments and identify leading and replicating cities.

The table template:

Asset name and type (platform, application, tool, labs (e.g. FabLab), legal context)
Description of the asset (3-4 lines max)
What will be done in the project in terms of scaling the asset and bring it to the market (3-4 lines max) - this could be legal practices as much as technologies.

When discussing the financing and partnership/budget model for reference zones, the following was concluded: Reference zones should, in addition to the information above, indicate a preferred financing/partnership model, either with 1-3 specific local organisations directly as partners in the project, or an alternative model where the reference zone development budget is held with a core partner, preferably the city administration, and a specific sub-contracting specification, including named partners, is supplied.

This must be done ASAP, in parallel with the above.

## 5. London WS Agenda

See [here](#).

## 4. Administrative/Housekeeping

Discussion ranged from partners to be included to many miscellaneous issues.

Novi Sad (and thus respective partners) have dropped out of the proposal preparations and as project partners/reference zone.

## 6. AOB

## 7. Closing

The meeting was closed at 11 pm CET by the Chairman.

### After-meeting Discussions with Certain Partners

- Additional horizontal partners
  - IoT integration: UDG Alliance (Sébastien) —> Advisory Board?
  - Communication: Ogilvy (Juanjo)

### Email sent to the consortium as follow-up

Dear all,

Following today's (Wednesday's) meeting, allow me to summarize a few main points leading to 48 productive hours in London next week, and to a fine finish.

There are action points for every partner, basically in two categories:

- deliver basic info (partner descriptions, reference zone basics etc.) ASAP,
- participate actively in welding the bits and pieces into a marvellous proposal, first of all by writing the sections with your name on (found in the London agenda and proposal timeline). Mikko and Mirko will bug you immediately if you don't.

The points I cover in this message are the following:

1. Process (teams and meetings)
2. London meeting (agenda, objectives)
3. Reference zones (description and theme development)
4. Partners (local and horizontal)
5. Project name and acronym

Be sure to read this email, especially if you weren't in the last two calls (with cities last Thursday and the weekly meeting today).

You will find the agenda and minutes from the meeting below[1], and I'll refer to specific online documents with direct links as well. This message is also inserted at the end of the minutes for reference.

Here we go.

## 1. PROCESS

We now have established productive working teams around three logics: (a) local reference zones, (b) work packages and (c) proposal sections. In addition to this, the coordination team keeps things, well, coordinated, and gives direction. Up until now, the giving direction and vision part has been very organic and tacit (at least to some). This will change somewhat as the input and development matures over the next week.

Each reference zone acts as a local group of stakeholders responsible for producing and coordinating input for the proposal, and engaging in the development of shared goals and activities. The zones are:

ANT (Antwerp+iMinds), Belgium

CAR (Carouge+Mandat International), Switzerland

EIN (Eindhoven+Philips, Atos), Netherlands

HEL (Forum Virium Helsinki, Aalto Uni), Finland

MAN (Manchester+Future Cities Catapult, Digital Catapult), UK

MIL (Milan+Engineering), Italy

POR (Porto), Portugal

SAN (Santander+Uni. Cantabria, Telefónica), Spain

This is the most dynamic part, and also the most vulnerable part of the proposal development. We rely on each of the partner/city groups to keep coordination tight. The vision is to shape a global urban IoT market based on European city needs, by showing what works on a large scale when we really push the envelope from a mature baseline. Envisioning this as a concerted, locally rooted effort is a very interactive exercise which cannot be easily delegated. The coming seven days will rely on these groups working as an agile collective on both local and project

level. I'll return to the content and process more specifically below. Main action point here is to HAVE ALL CITIES DIRECTLY LINKED INTO THE LONDON MEETING (both during the 48 hours and preparation before). Without direct participation and access to information, it will be very difficult to co-create the common themes and development plan.

The proposal sections are also integrated in the London meeting agenda, including responsible leads. In the proposal timeplan[2] you'll find each section, with responsible leads and dates for final versions. ALL PARTNERS HAVE SECTION RESPONSIBILITIES. By the end of this week, ALL PARTNER DESCRIPTIONS and ALL REFERENCE ZONE INPUT should be provided.

The work packages are available online[3] in iteratively more consolidated versions. We didn't spend lots of time in the weekly meeting discussing them, and there are still connections which can be shifted, but the teams are active, so dive in if you want to check specifics. We kick off the London meeting with a session on the WP tasks and relations. And end by suggesting effort distribution across partners.

We've had weekly meetings Wednesdays at 10-11 CET, which cover core issues. In addition, we had the first all-zones city meeting Thursday last week. In addition, smaller working groups have met in parallel offline. The London meeting will condensate all of these tracks. After London we shall keep the weekly Wednesday meeting, still only for the most pressing issues and (prepared) decisions. Actual development happens in the teams. Furthermore, I propose a city-focused meeting on Thursday March 31, 10-12 CET. Eventually, we have a final approval meeting of the entire proposal on Friday, April 8, 10-12 CET. All of this is noted in the proposal timeplan[2], and calendar invites will go out.

We won't call more all-hands physical meetings, but we may meet in core groups if needed. I happen to be in Eindhoven on Tuesday, March 29, and some will likely meet in the OASC/iMinds premises in Brussels in the latter days also, to finetune the engagement part (WP1/5/6).

## 2. LONDON MEETING

As you are hopefully all aware, the London meeting is Monday to Wednesday next week (March 21-23). The agenda is online[4].

Register ASAP in the sheet provided by Nadia[5]. Venue details are in the enclosing folder[6]. Monday/Tuesday are at the Future Cities Catapult/Nadia, Wednesday at the Digital Catapult/Alex (one underground stop apart).



The meeting has two overall objectives: to ensure that the overall vision and themes are co-created in a way which both hits the call objectives and ignites the resources of the reference zone stakeholders; and to ensure that the proposal is created with all sections and elements fleshed out and linked coherently with only specific chunks to be formulated in the following days.

In order for this to work, we have created an agenda which contains a few plenary sessions -- focusing on overview and alignment -- and many parallel, interactive and iterative sessions on specific sections. It will be very difficult to contribute to the proposal if a partner is not present. We have the possibility of remote participation, but it will not be nearly as effective, and especially the local reference zone collaboration will be challenged when the iterations are quick and concrete if one party is not engaged. Ultimately, the coordination is responsible for quality assessment and contingency planning for the proposal development, and this element is foreseen as absolutely essential. We shall therefore put emphasis on the commitments that can be made on-site and in active dialog with the collective as a whole.

The weekly Wednesday morning meeting will naturally be replaced by the London agenda that week.

### 3. REFERENCE ZONES

There is some work left to elicit, share and fuse the city/reference zone status and ambitions. To be structural, we need both the "State of the Art" (status) and "Beyond State of the Art" (ambition) both on an individual reference zone level and project level, and we need it from some key perspectives, such as technical assets (e.g. Technology Readiness Levels), usage (e.g. engagement/transactions), market, legal/governance situation and impact (e.g. policy change, cost reduction, improved governance). This, in turn, needs to be translated into local and project-wide objectives with KPIs and a work plan. Overall, we're aiming for 2-4 themes which will be translated into local implementations of new/improved services, using shared enablers.

Currently, this is captured in several places:

In the Reference Zone Matrix[7] you find two sheets: an overview of the zones and a functional matrix structured by application domains and themes. **ALL LOCAL REFERENCE ZONE TEAMS SHOULD FILL THIS FUNCTIONAL MATRIX OUT** and use it actively to explore and suggest themes to move beyond the state of the art.

For each reference zone there's a proper description in the appropriate Reference Zones folder. This should provide a more elaborate and rich description of each reference zone, including:

- (a) a map (the reference zone is a specific geographic area, by the call definition),
- (b) a concise list of assets (in the minutes [1] you find an example),
- (c) any legal/governance extra freedom related to the reference zone (directly asked for in the call),
- (d) a local stakeholder/partner list (also related to budget and partner formalities).

The provisioning and co-creation is facilitated in London by Remco (as with the previous cities meeting), supported by Mikko and Mirko, who oversee the matrix and reference zone documentation. In the proposal, we have limited space in Sections 1-3 for description of reference zones. This will therefore go into relevant sections with concise information, and fuller descriptions will go in Section 4 Partner descriptions, with sub-section 4.2 having a proper description of each reference zone.

#### 4. PARTNERS

In connection to the reference zone descriptions, we discussed the local partnership models, both for financing and for formal participation. To quote the minutes[1]: "When discussing the financing and partnership/budget model for reference zones, the following was concluded: Reference zones should, in addition to the information above, indicate a preferred financing/partnership model, either with 1-3 specific local organisations directly as partners in the project, or an alternative model where the reference zone development budget is held with a core partner, preferably the municipality, and a specific sub-contracting specification, including named partners, is supplied."

This has two implications: First, no later than in London on Monday, EACH REFERENCE ZONE MUST PROPOSE A LOCAL MODEL, INCLUDING NAMED PARTNERS. After London we will only have time to include those who have been brought in in this structured fashion. Second, we leave it to the reference zones to propose a way to allocate funds locally which is optimal for them. There are pros and cons of having more full partners vs. sub-contracting, and sometimes non-government organizations have more flexibility, whereas public commitment to distributing funds seems more credible. In addition, there are the open calls. They are used to engage \*additional\* actors, both within the existing reference zones and in new sites.

After the meeting Wednesday there was a short follow-up discussion about additional horizontal partners. The concrete case was dissemination/integration partners and a communications partner. In general, the baseline now is not to include more partners, unless we really need them. We probably need a dedicated communications partner. We probably don't need more dissemination/integration partners. Decisions will be taken in London.

One way of linking key actors on the global IoT scene to the consortium would be through the Advisory Board. This will also be discussed in London. Feel free to propose candidates.

## 5. Name

Although we have six suggestions for a project name in the dedicated doc[8], no decision or consensus has been reached. The list is currently:

SCALE        Smart Cities Alliance for Large-scale Experimentation

OASIS OASC IoT Smart Cities

OILaSP        OASC IoT Large-Scale Pilot

CCL    Connected Cities for Large Scale IoT Pilots

CCN    European IoT Network for Connecting Cities

BYOC Bring Your Own City

Another approach would be anagrams, which produce zesty hits like:

Camp Mesh

Scam hemp

A Spec--hmm...

:o)

Anyway, feel free to vote or suggest in the doc.

With this I will end, reminding us that there is 26 days left until closure of the call, on April 12, 17:00 CET. You will all be invited, by PIC/main contact email to the Participant Portal so that you can gaze at the clock.

We can do it, and it will be great, but there are some "implementation details" which require a truly concerted effort. I look forward to doing that in London.

Cheers,

Martin

[1] Minutes:  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1lqC-2toFn5J213fvzo8ZGi2YWmzm3EmmZacNPdjJ8SU/>

[2] Timeplan:  
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1qZWJ4evEfAnijKZx5bN7yW5KrEmwrXANCWwd6YMA1kl/>

[3] WPs: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B4jiMzhNIS92NVVqSThHVXJwM2s>

[4] London agenda:  
[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KIWxwSHGOux1FILxw1-ltKu83t93Of-v8l\\_X8nvNdGU/](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KIWxwSHGOux1FILxw1-ltKu83t93Of-v8l_X8nvNdGU/)

[5] London sign-up:  
[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1fmr8uUltAmeJHheK0IGrPFXLe8YhAg3eq5t6F2\\_ZYXs/](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1fmr8uUltAmeJHheK0IGrPFXLe8YhAg3eq5t6F2_ZYXs/)

[6] Venue details: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B6nLNqwgI-RsZEIodmw2c1lqTDA>

[7] Reference Zone matrix:  
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1XzT5JxLzCNXgzcFFpggb2QioL2hHFBuHIRMt1XNi400/>

[8] Name list:  
[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/17ubU00Oy6wQZ4UKetZWfC3\\_ycwUO8B6u96gHvxHbX3U/](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/17ubU00Oy6wQZ4UKetZWfC3_ycwUO8B6u96gHvxHbX3U/)

--

Martin Brynskov, Ph.D.

Associate professor, interaction technologies

Aarhus University

Chair, Open & Agile Smart Cities // [oascities.org](http://oascities.org)

Research director, AU Smart Cities // [smartcities.au.dk](http://smartcities.au.dk)

Director, Digital Design Lab // [ddlab.dk](http://ddlab.dk)

Participatory IT Centre // Digital Urban Living // CAVI

Tel. (+45) 3068 0424

More info: <http://au.dk/en/brynskov@cavi>