



COST
EUROPEAN COOPERATION
IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

COST Office
Avenue Louise 149
1050 Brussels, Belgium
t: +32 (0)2 533 3800
f: +32 (0)2 533 3890
office@cost.eu

www.cost.eu

Rome, 24 March 2013

Subject | Minutes of the Second Management Committee Meeting of COST Action IC1201 “Behavioural Types for Reliable Large-Scale Software Systems (BETTY)”

*Rome, Italy
24 March 2013*

1. Welcome to participants

The participants were welcomed by Dr Simon Gay, Chair of the Action. Dr Gay chaired the meeting.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda for the meeting was adopted (Annex 1). 16 parties were present, and so the meeting was quorate.

3. Approval of the minutes of the last meeting; matters arising from the minutes

The minutes of the kick-off meeting were approved. Under matters arising, Dr Gay noted that the BEAT workshop had taken place successfully in January, as part of the POPL conference in Rome, and thanked Dr Hans Hüttel for taking the lead in organising it.

4. Update from the Action Chair

Dr Gay reported that the Action now has 20 parties, an increase from 17 at the kick-off meeting. Lithuania is in the process of joining. During the preparation of these minutes, Estonia has also joined, so the number of parties is expected to be 22 in the near future. Dr Gay also reported that he had received a tentative enquiry from a researcher in Ukraine, which is not a COST country and does not have a reciprocal agreement with COST. This contact has not yet been followed up.

Dr Gay reported that the first budget period for the Action began on 1st March, and that the budget has been established at the grant-holding institution, Glasgow University.

Discussion of STSMs was deferred to item 6.



5. Confirmation/election of WG chairs and vice-chairs

As the election of WG chairs at the kick-off meeting had been agreed to be provisional, we reopened the discussion in order to establish whether we were happy for the provisional chairs to continue, and to fill the vacant vice-chair positions.

WG1: Dr Hans Hüttel, provisional chair, suggested that as WG1 is the largest and has a broad range of topics, it would be a good idea to elect a co-chair in order to share the workload and provide greater technical coverage. Prof. Vasco Vasconcelos agreed to take this role and was elected unanimously; therefore Dr Hüttel and Prof. Vasconcelos were confirmed as co-chairs of WG1. Dr Ivan Lanese had previously offered to serve a vice-chair of WG1, and we unanimously agreed to accept his offer; he was therefore appointed as vice-chair.

WG2: Dr Ilaria Castellani and Dr Hugo Vieira were unanimously confirmed as chair and vice-chair of WG2, having indicated their willingness to continue.

WG3: Dr Giuseppe Castagna and Dr Luca Padovani were unanimously confirmed as chair and vice-chair of WG3, having indicated their willingness to continue. We noted that Dr Castagna had not been able to attend either this meeting or the kick-off meeting, and we agreed to check whether his other commitments would enable him to lead WG3's activities during the rest of the year.

WG4: Dr Peter Wong indicated that he was willing to continue as chair, but expressed concern about the workload. We agreed that it would be important to elect a vice-chair who would be willing to take an active role in sharing the work. Dr Nikolaos Sismanis offered to serve as vice-chair, and we unanimously agreed to confirm Dr Wong and elect Dr Sismanis as chair and vice-chair, respectively.

6. Discussion of STSM procedure and election of STSM committee

Prof. Silvia Ghilezan had been elected as STSM coordinator at the kick-off meeting. Although she was not able to attend this meeting, she had prepared a proposal for handling applications for STSMs, in consultation with Dr Gay and Dr António Ravara. Dr Ravara presented the proposal (Annex 2) and answered questions. One question concerned 3-way STSMs, i.e. two people simultaneously visiting a third person in order to enable a 3-way collaboration. Dr Ravara confirmed that this would be allowed.

The proposed STSM policy states that the STSM coordinator and the WG chairs should constitute a committee to consider STSM applications, and that if any applications are received from members of the committee, then such applications should be considered by the other members. The formation of this committee, and the STSM policy, were unanimously approved.

7. Promotion of gender balance and of early stage researchers

Dr Gay noted that we have a good gender balance in relation to computer science as a whole, and that the WG sessions earlier in the day had included several contributions from both women and early stage researchers.

8. Update from the DC Rapporteur

Our DC Rapporteur, Prof. Jan Mikkelsen (University of Aalborg, DK), gave a short presentation (Annex 3). He reminded us to work on the goals identified in the MoU and to provide success stories to the COST office, and outline his role in assessing our work on behalf of the DC.



9. Annual Progress Conference preparation

Dr Gay noted, and Prof. Mikkelsen confirmed, that the ICT Domain Annual Progress Conference will take place from 12th-14th June in Malta. Dr Gay will attend, and as our Action is still near the beginning, his report to the conference will focus on presenting the aims of BETTY rather than results.

10. Follow-up of MoU objectives

Review of the day's WG sessions

Dr Gay thanked the WG chairs and vice-chairs, and all those who gave talks, for their work on the WG sessions during the day. We discussed the format of the sessions, and agreed that at the next WG meetings, which will take place with the first open workshop in September, we should have more time for discussion and also we should find a way to introduce more structure to the discussions (for example, by orienting the sessions around problems). In particular, the relationships between the WGs should be explicitly discussed, and we need the sessions to produce a synthesis of topics and results rather than just a collection of talks.

We agreed that we need two full days for the WG sessions next time, and that they should be after the open workshop. We agreed that the WG sessions should not take the form of half a day for each WG in turn, but should be more integrated.

Prof. Wadler also suggested that it might be worthwhile, during the WG meetings, for people to present other people's work instead of their own.

Contacting other projects

Dr Gay noted that in the MoU we said that we would make contact with certain other European projects, in particular HATS, ASCENS and ANIKETOS. He had not yet done so, but would do so. Dr Mario Bravetti reported that the HATS project, which he was a member of, has already ended, but we agreed that it would be useful to obtain its final reports. It was noted that Rocco De Nicola, who many of us know, is a member of the ASCENS project. We also noted that the ANIKETOS project, which focuses on security from a more practical perspective, might have some interests in common with ours.

11. Scientific Planning

Dr Gay reported that the proposal to hold our first open workshop in association with the SEFM (Software Engineering and Formal Methods) conference in Madrid in September, had been accepted. This means that the workshop will be on September 23rd and 24th, and the WG meetings (and MC meeting) on September 25th and 26th. Prof. Wadler noted that these dates clash with ICFP (International Conference on Functional Programming). However, we unanimously agreed to continue with the proposed association with SEFM, as it is so difficult to find a date that doesn't clash with anything.

We agreed that the open workshop would be a successor to the BEAT workshop held in January. We agreed to form a programme committee by taking one person from each country participating in BETTY, either one of the MC members or another person suggested by the MC members. Dr Gay said that he is willing to serve as PC chair for the first workshop, and this was accepted.

Dr Ravara suggested that in the future we should hold WG and MC meetings in association with ETAPS, which we did this year, and hold the open workshop and WG and MC meetings in association with



CONCUR, which we are not doing this year because CONCUR is in Argentina. We noted that as ETAPS is at the end of March, and CONCUR is at the end of August, this would give a reasonable spacing during each year. This proposal was agreed, but we noted that it depends on the conferences taking place in Europe.

Dr Gay noted that we are committed to producing a state-of-the-art report for each WG, by the end of the first year of the Action, meaning the end of October. We agreed that it would be good to find a way to publish these reports as journal articles, or in a similar way, so that everyone who contributes can receive proper credit. The WG chairs should act as editors and coordinators for these reports. ACM Computing Surveys was suggested as a suitable journal, and MC members were asked to think of other possibilities.

It was suggested that we could define a series of challenge problems for techniques and tools in the area of behavioural types, and that such problems could be used as the basis for competitions, in a similar way to what the theorem-proving and model-checking communities do. We agreed that this would be a good idea, but details were left for further discussion during the coming months. It would be necessary to identify a collection of problems or use-cases to serve as benchmarks.

12. Requests for new members

None; we are still in the first year of the Action, so new countries can join without requiring our approval.

13. Non-COST applications to the Action

The enquiry from a researcher in Ukraine was mentioned under Item 4. Dr Gay will pursue it.

14. Any Other Business

Dr Hüttel noted that a researcher from New Zealand, Dr David Pearce, had participated in the BEAT workshop and that he might be interested in BETTY. Dr Gay will ask him.

15. Location and Date of Next Meeting

September 25th or 26th, during or after the WG meetings, in Madrid.

16. Summary of MC Decisions

As we were running short of time, we agreed that the summary of the MC decisions would be left to the minutes.

17. Closing

Dr Gay thanked everyone for their participation.



**Agenda
Management Committee Meeting**

COST Action no. IC1201

Action Title: Behavioural Types for Reliable Large-Scale Software Systems (BETTY)

Venue Rome, Country Italy, on 24th March 2013

1. Welcome to participants
2. Adoption of agenda
3. Approval of minutes and matters arising of last meeting
4. Update from the Action Chair
 - a. Status of Action, including participating count
 - b. Action budget status
 - c. STSM status and new applications
5. Confirmation/election of WG chairs and vice-chairs
6. Discussion of STSM procedure and election of STSM committee
7. Promotion of gender balance and of Early Stage Researchers (ESR)
8. Update from the DC Rapporteur
9. Annual Progress Conference Preparation
10. Follow-up of MoU objectives
 - a. Review of the WG meetings: what should we change next time?
11. Scientific planning
 - a. Scientific strategy: WG activity during the rest of the year
 - b. Action Budget Planning
 - c. Long-term planning (including anticipated locations and dates of future activities; especially the 2nd meeting of this year, in Madrid in September)
 - d. Dissemination planning (publications and outreach activities)
12. Requests for new members
13. Non-COST applications to the Actions
14. AOB
15. Location and date of next meeting
16. Summary of MC decisions
17. Closing



COST is supported
by the EU Framework Programme

EUROPEAN SCIENCE FOUNDATION ESF provides the COST Office
through a European Commission contract

BETTY IC1201

SHORT TERM SCIENTIFIC MISSIONS

APPLICATIONS

OBJECTIVE

To establish or strengthen collaboration, especially when the expected outcome is a joint publication between Action members. STSM must be between participating countries. It cannot be within the same country.

DURATION

STSM, minimum one week (5 working days), maximum 3 months.

Exception can be made for Early Stage Researchers (less than PhD + 8 years): up to 6 months, with prior Management Committee approval.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The financial contribution for a STSM will be a fixed grant based on the applicant's budget request and the evaluation of the application by the STSM assessment committee. The grant will not necessarily cover all costs of the visit. The grant only covers travel and subsistence.

Recommended (but not obligatory) amounts:

EUR up to 100 for daily allowance (depending on the location)

EUR 300 for travel.

The total should not exceed EUR 2500 up to 3 months (or EUR 3500 for Early Stage Researchers – above 3 months).

Any exception needs prior approval from the COST Office.

HOW TO APPLY

The procedure concerning STSMs is governed by the COST Vademecum ([link 1](#)), in particular, Chapter 4 ([link 2](#)). Below is a summary of the application rules, though the legally binding version is in the [Vademecum](#).

All applicants must read Chapter 4 of the Vademecum ([link 2](#)) before preparing their request for an STSM.

The Applicant must use the [on-line registration tool](#) to register their request for an STSM. The following information has to be encoded with the registration:

1. the Action number (IC1201) ;
2. the title of the planned STSM;
3. the start and end date;
4. applicant's title, name, work place, postal address, telephone and fax numbers, and email address;
5. a short CV;
6. a short description of the proposed workplan (about 250 words);
7. the applicant's bank details;
8. the host's details;
9. financial data (amount for travel and subsistence).

The on-line registration tool will issue a formal STSM application which has to be downloaded and sent by the applicant electronically (via e-mail as attachment) together with any necessary document which the Applicant may regard as helpful in supporting the application at the evaluation process (such as CV, full workplan, list of publications, motivation letter, letter of support from the home institute etc.) to the future **Host institution of the STSM** and to the **STSM coordinator, Silvia Ghilezan (gsilvia@uns.ac.rs)**, STSM assessment committee members **Antonio Ravara (aravara@fct.unl.pt)** and ...(**third member?**) with the **subject "BETTY STSM Application *applicant's name*"**.

DEADLINES

6 weeks before the start of the STSM.

ASSESSMENT

After the assessment of the proposal, the STSM coordinator will inform the applicant about the decision.

AFTER THE STSM

After completion of the STSM the grantee is required to submit a short scientific report on the visit within 4 weeks after the stay. The report with the subject "BETTY STSM *reference number*, *grantee's name*" should be sent to the

- Silvia Ghilezan (gsilvia@uns.ac.rs)
- Antonio Ravara (aravara@fct.unl.pt)
- (**third member?**)
- Host institution

The report should contain the following information:

- purpose of the STSM;
- description of the work carried out during the STSM;
- description of the main results obtained;
- future collaboration with host institution (if applicable);
- foreseen publications/articles resulting or to result from the STSM (if applicable);
- confirmation by the host institution of the successful execution of the STSM;
- other comments (if any).



The Role of the DC Rapporteur

Jan H. Mikkelsen

2nd IC1201 (BETTY) meeting, Rome, 24 March 2013



Who am I

- Jan Hvolgaard Mikkelsen
 - Associate Professor with Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark
- Research areas
 - RF IC design, low-power circuit and system design, UWB circuit and systems, wireless sensor networks, energy harvesting, microwave theory, and health applications
- COST ICT-DC committee member since 2010



The DC Rapporteur

- Scientific expert (within her/his field)
- Liaison between COST Actions and COST Domain Committees
- Monitors Action progress
- Provides guidance for COST newcomers
- Participates in final assessment



DC Rapporteur - Monitoring

- Monitor Action
 - To be invited to all meetings, reimbursed by Action - but no budget impact
 - Should attend at least one MC meeting per year
 - May attend WG meetings if necessary
- Provide yearly report to DC
- Assess Action progress during APC
- Member of final assessment panel



Scientific Evaluation Criteria

- Achievement of MoU objectives
- Implementation of Action structure
 - Functioning of Management Committee
 - Setup of suitable WG & training schools
 - Dissemination and website
- Implementation of Action strategy
 - Appropriate use of networking tools



Scientific Evaluation Criteria

- Appropriate use of budget for scientific activities
- Implementation of COST strategic goals
 - Promotion of young researchers
 - Gender and country balance
- Scientific output through networking
- Capacity building through networking
- Dissemination of results (publications, patents, website)



General Assessment

- Internal Action communication
 - Communication Chair – Rapporteur
 - Communication Chair – Grant holder
- Administrative management
 - Budget implementation
 - Compliance with COST rules
 - Compliance with deadlines & reporting



Action Outcome

- Remarkable achievements
- General indicators
 - Website
 - STSMs
 - Meeting organization & visibility
 - Capacity building through networking
 - Joint publications
- Joint research applications (national as well as international), PhD committees



Thank you

COST Office
Avenue Louise 149
1050 Brussels, Belgium
T: +32 (0)2 533 3800
F: +32 (0)2 533 3890

www.cost.eu