

# Coordinating an ICT project

Mirja Kühlewind <[mirja.kuehlewind@tik.ee.ethz.ch](mailto:mirja.kuehlewind@tik.ee.ethz.ch)>

Project Coordinator of the H2020-ICT MAMI project

Feb 25, 2016



measurement and architecture for a middleboxed internet

**measurement**

**architecture**

**experimentation**



*This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 688421. The opinions expressed and arguments employed reflect only the authors' view. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of that information.*



*Supported by the Swiss State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation under contract number 15.0268. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Swiss Government.*

---

# Overview: MAMI

## Measurement and Architecture for a Middleboxed Internet



### Objectives

1. Large-scale measurements of deployed middleboxes [WP1]
2. An architecture for middlebox cooperation [WP3]
3. Experimental evaluation of use case applicability and deployability [WP2]

### Project Structure

WP4: Standardisation, Dissemination, and Exploitation (4 deliverables, 5 tasks)

WP5: Project Management and Scientific Coordination (3 deliverables, 2 tasks)

- Others: 2-3 Deliverables per WP; 4-5 tasks per WP
- 10 (initially 7) MS: software releases, workshops, internal accounting reports



- ICT-12-2015: Integrating experiments and facilities in FIRE
  - Publication date: 23 July 2014
  - Deadline: 14 April 2015
- Research and Innovation action (RIA)
  - „Proposals requesting a *Small contribution* are expected“
  - 13 Mio € in total for Research and Innovation Actions
  - small contribution ~2 Mio
- 38 proposals, 10 accepted (6 RIA and 4 IA)

---

# Projekt Facts



- **Budget**

total 2.9 Mio (1.63 Mio funded by EU, 1.27 Mio by SERI)

- **Consortium**

7 partners (3 universities, 1 research institute, 2 industry)

- **Man Power and Duration**

~8 FTE over 30 months

---

## Time Line (1)



- **Oct 1, 2014:** First email with initial slide to potential partners (4 universities and 3 industrial companies)
  - Commitment and potential contribution
- **Nov 5, 2014:** First call with 5 out of 7 potential partners
  - Mailing list created
  - Updated slides to send to the commission for feedback
- **Dec 15, 2014:** second call
  - Proposal writing phase (googledocs)
  - Needed new/more industry partners

---

## Time Line (2)



- **Jan 28, 2015:** Physical meeting co-located with workshop
  - Initial text in all/most sections before meeting (mainly part 2 on impact was missing)
  - Common view on project goals and content
  - Final decision on EU call
- **Feb 18, 2015:** Call to finalize work package structure
  - Further: editors assigned to all missing sections
- **March 4, 2015:** Call to finalize proposal description
  - Further added two more (industry) partners
  - Finally decided about project lead

---

## Time Line (3)



- **25 March, 2015:** Informal dinner at IETF
  - Goal: all text contributions before IETF meeting
  - Final reviews until deadline
- **14 April, 2015:** submission
  - Final edits by me and my colleague Brian in the week before the deadline
  - Consistency checks in work packages and accounting/financial data

---

# Review Comments

## 3 Criteria, Threshold: 3/5.00 for each



### Excellence (Score: 4.50)

- *"The objectives are clear...", "...concept that is sound, interesting and relevant to the call.", "Convincing evidence ... regarding the technical feasibility..."*
- *"The claims on **privacy** applications are not convincingly justified."*

### Impact (Score: 4.50)

- *"...clearly addresses all the expected impacts listed in the work programme.", "...plan for dissemination is very good and it addresses a range of well-targeted stakeholders with appropriate actions."*
- *"The impact on privacy [...] is not convincingly presented.", "No appropriate **metrics/KPIs** are proposed to measure the effectiveness of the dissemination actions."*

### Quality and efficiency of the implementation (Score: 3.50)

- *"The work plan is coherent and light with a small number of deliverables appropriate to a 30-month project.", "The participants clearly possess the required expertise.", "The presence of an External Advisory Board will be beneficial given the limited industrial participation."*
- *"There are tasks without associated deliverables...", "The number of proposed **milestones** is too low. **Task leaders** are not identified.", "The reduced participation and commitment of **Industry** is considered a weakness."*



---

# Challenges/Problems



- Finding industry partner
  - none of the initial 3 are in the project
  - last partner committed in March
- Deciding for a project coordinator
- Organizing the review process
- Fitting it to the call
- And fitting the budget to the call
- Witting the impact and exploitation section
- Balance between research and concrete ideas

---

# Tips and Tricks



- 1-2 people that lead the proposal and will probably also provide up to 2/3 of the text contribution
- Having a core of people that know each other well
- Having a clear goal for the output of the project
  - Detailed work plan
  - Clear idea what each partner wants to do and how this contributes to the project as a whole