

# OASC F2F Agenda

## 1. Meeting Information

Date/time of the Meeting:	March 21-23, 2016
Name of the meeting:	F2F proposal writing meeting
Place of the meeting:	London Monday: FCC <a href="http://futurecities.catapult.org.uk/contact-us/">http://futurecities.catapult.org.uk/contact-us/</a>  Tue: FCC <a href="http://futurecities.catapult.org.uk/contact-us/">http://futurecities.catapult.org.uk/contact-us/</a>  Wednesday: DigiCat: <a href="https://www.digitalcatapultcentre.org.uk/contact/">https://www.digitalcatapultcentre.org.uk/contact/</a>
Phone details (if online):	<a href="https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/156586477">https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/156586477</a>

## 2. Attendees

Final list TBC

From 1 pm onwards on Mon 21-Mar-2016 the following persons were present:

	<i>First name</i>	<i>Surname</i>	<i>Partner entity</i>	<i>Ref Zone affiliation/linkage</i>
1	Stefano	De Panfilis	Engineering	Milan
2	Martino	Maggio	Engineering	Milan (left towards 4 pm on Day 2)
3	Lanfranco	Marasso	engineering	Milan (left towards 1 pm on Day 2)
4	Bram	Lievens	iMinds	Antwerp
5	David	Gómez	UNICAN	Santander

6 Alexander Gluhak Digicat Manchester (present physically on Day 1, virtually part of Day 2, hosting the meeting physically on Day 3)

7 Mirko Presser Alexandra Inst. -

8 Terry Norman FCC Manchester

9 Adrian Slatcher Manchester City Council Manchester

10 Muijs Remco Philips Eindhoven

11 Nadia Echchihab FCC Manchester

12 Martin Brynskov Aarhus Uni -

13 Mikko Riepula Aalto Helsinki

Joined at 14h20 on Day 1

14 Juanjo Hierro Telefonica Santander

15 Sergio Garcia Telefonica Santander

Joined around 15h on Day 1:

16 Pentti Launonen Aalto

17 Ilkka Lakaniemi Aalto

Joined on Day 2 (Tue) in the morning:

18 Paulo Calçada City of Porto Porto

19 Nuria De Lama Atos

### 3. Agenda

**Day 1: Monday, 21.03.16, Future Cities Catapult**

Time	What	Session lead
12:00-13:00	Arrivals	Register arrival <a href="#">here</a>
13:00-15:00	Work package descriptions (per WP track)	WP Leads / individual tables
	Complete task descriptions, clarify partner contributions, define key target outcomes and deliverables	Some rotation half way through so partners can contribute to multiple ones
15:00-18:00	Vision, project objectives and impact (parallel tracks)	People may want to swap half way through
	<b>Section 1.1/1.2 Introduction and relationship to work programme</b>	Alex moderates

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intro and key problem statement(s)</li> <li>• List of high level objectives based on WP inputs and measure of how to achieve them</li> <li>• Table on how we tick call objectives</li> </ul>	
	<b>Section 2.1 Impact</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collection of city and partner assets and their initial description</li> <li>• Table of impact listed in the work programme vs project</li> <li>• Agree on other parts in the section</li> <li>• First list of wider impacts</li> </ul>	Pentti moderates
	<b>Section 2.2 Dissemination</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders identification</li> <li>• Engagement strategy for each stakeholder group</li> <li>• Engagement time line</li> <li>• Links to WP1/5/6 activities where main engagement will take place</li> </ul>	Martin and Nadia moderate

## Day 2: Tuesday, 22.03.16, Future Cities Catapult

Time	What	Session lead
09:00-13:00	<b>Section 1.4 - Reference zone pilots</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write down and refine pilot descriptions in reference zones and across these</li> <li>• Focus should be on pilot ideas that push the boundaries of current business practices and legislative framework</li> </ul>	Remco facilitates  Reference zones will be clustered into overlapping themes
13:00-14:00	<b>Lunch break</b>	
14-15	Budget discussions	Martin
15:00-18:00	Main concept, ambition and impact (parallel tracks)	Some rotation half way through so partners can contribute to multiple ones
	<b>Section 1.3: Motivation, concept and approach</b>	Mirko moderates

	<b>Section 1.4: Pilot descriptions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalisation of descriptions from morning session</li> </ul>	Remco moderates  Key city partner to work on this
	<b>Section 1.5 Ambition</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification of key contents of SOTA and structure</li> <li>Identification of advances to SOTA in comparison table</li> </ul>	Mikko moderates
	<b>Section 2.1 Impact</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand on impact section from first day</li> <li>Identification of measurable impact targets</li> </ul>	Pentti moderates

### Day 3: Wednesday, 23.03.16, Digital Catapult

People still present on Day 3: Mirko, Alex, Pentti, Adrian, Nuria, Sergio, Bram (leaving around 10 am), David, Martin, Mikko.

Bram presented WP1 objectives and leads the writing process & proposes names of people who could be task leaders and thus write the respective parts of the proposal text.

The name “SynchroniCity” was adopted for the project.

### Working sessions (0900):

- Pentti, Nuria and Mirko section 2
- Alex, Nadia, Juanjo and Sergio section 1
- Mikko, Adrian (on Manchester) - RZ descriptions, base applications
- Need to also work on milestones and deliverable (Gantt) - Alex, Mirko, Martin and Mikko
- Make a plan that takes us to submission - Martin, Mikko and Mirko

Time	What	Session lead
09:00-13:00	<b>Section 3: Implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalise the objectives and task descriptions</li> <li>Finalise the milestones, deliverables</li> </ul>	Alex/Mirko/Mikko

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalise overall work plan story</li> <li>• Gantt chart with deliverables</li> <li>• Pert chart</li> </ul>	
	<b>Ethics and legal</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop core story line - use OrganiCity as a guidance</li> </ul>	Martin
13:00-14:00	<b>Lunch break</b>	
	Wrapup - further writing for the enthusiasts	

Missing from the agenda:

- First discussion on budgets.
- Planning beyond London
- Next F2F (Brussels?)

## 4. Minutes

### 1st session on Day 1 (Mon) afternoon: Open Calls/Policy Change

Terry Norman (FCC) presented their view on benefits of IOT to cities: evidence-based policy change via two phased open calls. The consensus was that the first round of development is to be done by the consortium members and open calls serve the purpose in the second iteration.

#### WP Structure

The following WP structure was confirmed:

WP1 Foundations

WP2 Architecture

WP3 Services

WP4 Validation

WP5 Open Calls

WP6 Impact, sustainability

**Discussion on Themes** was opened (but not closed?):

1. IOT-enabled policy
  2. personal/commercial data sharing
- ...?

## 2nd session on Day 1 (Mon) afternoon: WP drill-down

Current plans for all Work Packages (except WP7, management) were discussed and somewhat refined. See details [here](#).

Day ended at 18 h

## 1st session on Day 2 (Tue) morning: Focusing the choice of app domains and themes

Discussion revolved around choosing the application domains to focus on and highlight as well as the most important transversal themes. The following emerged from the discussion:

### 1 - Context-adaptive Traffic Management

### 2 - Multi-modal Transportation/Smart Mobility or Mobility as a Service

- **Smart Parking specifically**

### 3 - Community-based policy or Dynamic **policy making based on (and for) IOT**

- Using IOT data as such as evidence for policy-making, e.g. use of noise sensor data to determine allowed times for vehicles, restaurants, noisy events etc.
- Policies for how to roll out IOT and how to use IOT data in terms of privacy concerns, MyData etc.
- Adrian's concern: how to make the minimal necessary (policy/system) changes in order to achieve the targets (e.g. in terms of air quality): more extensive sensor network and better analysis of data required. (Manchester)

### 4 - do we have a 4th one?

Tourism?

Safety in the City (surveillance)?

Elderly care?

Energy efficiency?

Waste Management was the closest candidate

**... but it was decided: NO for the 4th app domain/theme**

Other applications are not excluded; however these 4 app domains/themes are the ones to highlight in the common part of Ch 1 of the application.

Relating to point 2), Helsinki multi-modal (public) transport route planner is in action; future extensions could be e.g.

- +car sharing
- +air quality considerations

## Partner List

It was agreed to complement the list of partners (beneficiaries as parties to the grant agreement, ? or 3rd parties?) with the following entities (ie. to add them to the partner list):

- Eindhoven: a name that sounded like iMinds....
- Antwerp: no decision
- Helsinki: no decision
- Manchester: Manchester Metropolitan University (its School of Architecture); possibly 1-2 SME's like BronzeLabs.
- Milan: no need, provided some subcontracting budget is reserved
- Porto: Ubiware -- provided they commit exclusively to our proposal. ConnectingThings? Subcontracting budget for engaging Porto University, i.e. not required as a beneficiary.
- Santander: TST Sistemas

## 1st afternoon session on Day 2 (Tue): Budget guidelines

The budgeting approach was discussed.

## 2nd afternoon session on Day 2 (Tue): Chapter 1 of the application text

Ch 1: Excellence

**1.1 Vision, Motivation and Objectives (Alex)**

**1.2 Relationship to the work programme (Alex can wrap up but need you guys to populate with concrete arguments and try to fill gaps)**

### **1.3 Key concepts and approach (description from open call mechanisms)**

- The OASC Principles and FIWARE

#### **1.4 Our Reference Zones**

The as-is. Refer to “straight-jacket” template provided by Mikko earlier. Should include a description (table) of ecosystem players’ roles

#### **1.5 Ambition**

Start with a short common description.

The to-be. Refer to “straight-jacket” template provided by Mikko earlier. Should include a description (table) of ecosystem players’ roles.