**MOnarCH FlashMeeting Minutes**

(13-03-2013, 14:00 CET)

Atendees: João Sequeira, Pedro Lima, Rodrigo Ventura, Alessandro Saffiotti, Federico Pecora, Victor González, Fernando Nabais, Marco Barbosa, João Estilita, Paulo Alvito, Alcherio Martinoli, Andreas Breitenmoser, Gwenn Englebienne

A replay of the meeting can be accessed at <http://fm-openlearn.open.ac.uk/fm/c42360-20518>

- The Coordinator briefed the Consortium with information on IPOL, templates for deliverables, and website. Everyone will have to provide some input, namely the descriptions of the institutions. There are deliverables being due soon, namely D8.8.2 and D8.8.3.

- All partners agree that the level of detail in the storyboard script documents is ok. Technical requirements are covered partially, mainly at low level. Still, maybe more abstract requirements for planning and coordination are needed. Also, the storyboard scripts need to be completed with the events associated.

- The requirements document is very low level stuff but it should scale up to the level of detail developers require. The aim of the document is to unfold things from the very low level to the very high level. The success criteria in the document were intended to be “common sense”.

- Some adjustments/clarifications are needed at some point of the requirements document, e.g., in B09.

- It may be necessary to establish some form of ground truth for the performance of behaviors (and some infrastructure to measure it). Otherwise, the success criteria may be highly subjective. There is literature on how to evaluate behaviors but it is clear that it is a very subjective topic.

- Introducing the idea of state for behaviors may be a good idea.

- The performance of a localization system may differ depending if the measurement is made under controlled/uncontrolled conditions. It is still to be clarified the strategy to actually measure the criteria. Eventually, measurements will be done in a controlled environment.

- It makes sense to test some perception components, e.g., localization, with the primitive behaviors, for instance in point-to-point navigation. This may set a baseline performance to that may be helpful when assessing social navigation, though in social navigation accuracy may not be an issue.

- As they are currently stated in the requirements document, it is unclear if the success criteria are the thresholds the behaviors have to pass in order to “gain access” to the storyboards, or they are the measurements that will be used to evaluate how well the system performs. In the second option a ground truth will be required.

- There are 3 different interpretations for the success criteria in the requirements document, (i) design requirements, without them the system does not work, (ii) internally measurably (by the robot) conditions that define events, (iii) external performance metrics an observer uses to evaluate the system. The update of the requirements document should include 3 columns to express these 3 views for each behavior.

- ST will filter out the updated document for inconsistencies.

- There can be also some metrics on low level electronics that may be included at this stage, e.g., for how long the robot can work without stopping.

- The robots should be defined in a very near future. Also other systems such as the UWB for localization. IDM will start detailing the robots in a document to be shared with the Consortium.

- A meeting with the informatics people at IPOL is already scheduled to discuss what is the hardware and sensors that can be installed there, etc

- For the gaming storyboard it is fundamental to know this as soon as possible. If it not possible to use UWB then we must leverage on PO robots.

- YDR referred that the proposal mixed augmented reality and interaction which they understand as 2 completely different things. YDR expressed that their success criteria is customer satisfaction measured empirically.

- The rules of the interactive game may need to be adjusted. The game defined in the Interactive Game Storyboard is intended to be mainly “positional” and using very simple strategies (in the intellectual range of young children). The references to the “game of go” in the proposal and DoW must be understood as indicative. In fact the original game of go may be too complex for most children under 16. The game must be easy to explain to children. Also, it is necessary to keep in mind that children at IPOL are of very different cultural/socio-economical backgrounds.

- An alternative perspective is to keep the current version of the game, as sketched in the Interactive Game Storyboard, and say to the children that this is the game the robots like to play (even if it is a very simple game).

- EPFL considers testing the game in non-patient children at their testbed. This could be very interesting to tune the rules and, eventually, to end with a MOnarCH game that has no resemblance with the game-of-go.

- Eventually, it can make sense to come up with simulation tools for the kids to play.

- Though dealing with positions in Robotics has lesser issues than dealing also with velocities, movement is an important component of the interaction. Also, the video projector can be very important for entertainment. It must be rich enough to be entertaining in the long run.

- All these comments are very important and must be included in the storyboards, maybe in the introduction. Everyone must contribute to the update of these documents.

- Eventually, the initiatives/testing of concepts involved in the storyboards, e.g., having kids at EPFL testing the game, are very interesting and important for dissemination and should be included in D8.8.2 – Dissemination Plan.

- No further issues were discussed. Meeting ended at 15:30 CET.