

W3C WoT Workshop

Program Committee

23 April 2019

Agenda

- Submissions review and assignments
 - Review Guidelines
 - Presentation Guidelines (deferred)
- Q&A

22 Program Committee Members

- Sebastian Käbis, Siemens
- Michael Lagally, Oracle
- Matthias Kovatsch, Huawei
- Kazuyuki Ashimura, W3C
- Dave Raggett, W3C
- Dan Brickley, Google
- Kathy Giori, Mozilla
- Eric Siow, Intel
- Michael Koster, SmartThings
- Ryuichi Matsukura, Fujitsu
- Kunihiro Toumura, Hitachi
- Tetsushi Matsuda, Mitsubishi
- Daniel Wilms, BMW
- Tomoaki Mizushima, IRI
- Wouter van der Beek, Cisco
- Joerg Heuer, EcoG
- Toru Kawaguchi, Panasonic
- Juejia Zhou, Xiaomi
- Qing An, Alibaba
- Dominique Guinard, EVERYTHING
- Ari Keränen, Ericsson
- Jens Schimmelpfennig, Software AG

Program Committee


- Goal: Select Papers + Presenters for the W3C Web of Things Workshop
 - Expression of Interest: just as ticket for participation in the workshop
 - Position Paper: as the basis of presentation during the workshop
 - Need to send a reminder to the submitters if there are submissions requesting presentations without attaching position papers
 - We should see how long each paper to be presented, e.g., 25mins or 5mins
- Selection Criteria:
 - Proposal matches to Workshop scope and topics defined at:
<https://www.w3.org/WoT/ws-2019/cfp.html#topics>
 - Proposal is forward-looking
 - Proposal matches new WoT charter
 - Proposal has practical relevance
 - Proposal talks about other IoT standards
 - Proponent has credibility
 - Proposal has product relation
 - Demo available

Timeline

- Initial PC call on 15.4.
- Submission deadline: 23.4.
- 2nd PC call: April 23rd , 3pm CEST– determine review criteria
- 3rd PC call: Monday, April 29th, 3pm CEST
- Review period is between April 23th and May 6th.
- Next PC call on May 6th to consolidate review feedback, draft agenda structure for the workshop.
- Final PC call on May 13th to decide on which presentations are selected and decide on agenda.

wotws2 List of Submissions

This table contains hidden fields:  [click here to select which fields should be visible.](#)

Shortcuts to papers:  (hide) [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#), [23](#), [24](#), [25](#), [26](#), [27](#), [28](#).

The time in the table is the last modification time.

#	Authors	Title	information	paper	assignment	update	Time
1	Michael Lagally	WoT and IoT: What's the difference?					Mar 06, 06:45
2	Hou Haibo	Hou Haibo,China Academy of Information and Communications Technology					Mar 18, 08:13
3	Gerhard Zehethofer	Expressions of interest					Apr 05, 07:31
4	Sascha Meckler	IoT-based supply chain monitoring					Apr 10, 14:07
5	Jose Manuel Cantera Fonseca and Martin Bauer	2nd W3C Workshop WoT. Position Statement from ETSI ISG CIM					Apr 11, 07:48
6	Victor Charpenay	Standard Behavior Descriptions for the Web of Things					Apr 12, 12:39
7	Tomoaki Mizushima	The Research and Survey of Use Case for WoT					Apr 15, 04:11
8	Zoltan Kis and Daniel Peintner	Scripting API for the Web of Things					Apr 15, 08:08
9	Kathy Giori	It Works! An Open WoT Framework (by Mozilla) Powers My Smart Home					Apr 15, 23:00
10	David Ezell	Expression of Interest on behalf of Conexxus and David Ezell					Apr 16, 16:01
11	Gilles Privat , Thierry Coupaye , Sebastien Bolle and Philippe Raipin	WoT Graph as Multiscale Digital-Twin for Cyber-Physical Systems-of-Systems					Apr 17, 16:17
12	Thomas Bergwinkl	Developer of the open source RDF library for Arduino SmallRDF					Apr 17, 22:02
13	Michael Jacoby, Hylke van der Schaaf, Josh Lieberman and Kathi Schleidt	How W3C Web of Things and OGC SensorThings API can work together and benefit from each other					Apr 18, 14:32
14	Marco Di Felice, Luca Sciallo, Lorenzo Gigli, Cristiano Aguzzi, Luca Roffia, Angelo Trotta and Tullio Salmon Cinotti	WoT Store: a Thing and Application Management Ecosystem for the W3C Web of Things					Apr 18, 16:42
15	Sebastian Kabisch, Christian Glomb, Charif Mahmoudi and Daniel Peintner	Web of Things Simplifies Industry Applications					Apr 18, 18:54
16	Philippe Coval	Walking through a "privacy by design" chain from sensors Microcontroller to XR (using Web Tech)					Apr 20, 10:09
17	Johannes Hund	Unleashing the masses: developing IoT applications should be easy for everybody					Apr 20, 11:12
18	Ryuichi Matsukura, Takehisa Suzuki and Takuki Kamiya	A WoT gateway with legacy devices virtualization					Apr 22, 21:44
19	Eric Siow and Michael McCool	Next Steps for the Web of Things, Part 1: Identifying and Understanding the Focus Market					Apr 23, 00:38
20	Michael McCool and Eric Siow	Next Steps for the Web of Things, Part 2: Data Standards Development and Consolidation					Apr 23, 00:40
21	Kunihiko Toumura, Kazuhito Yokoi and Tetsuhiko Hirata	Rapid IoT application development using the Web of Things					Apr 23, 02:52
22	Xiaowei Jiang and Jay Zhou	Connecting People and Home – MIoT Platform introduction					Apr 23, 02:54
23	Toru Kawaguchi and Takeshi Yamada	Realizing Lifestyle update through Web of Things					Apr 23, 06:20
24	Hassib Belhaj Hassine, Ege Korkan and Sebastian Steinhörst	Virtual-Thing: Thing Description based Virtualization					Apr 23, 10:38
25	Tim Panton	Re-purposing existing web standards for secure, usable, distributed access to IoT devices					Apr 23, 11:30
26	Nonoka Jinushi	Expression of Interest					Apr 23, 11:54
27	Dominique Guinard	The Web of small things					Apr 23, 12:24

How to review

- We must have at least 3 reviews for each submission.
 - The followings are example guidelines:
 - You may choose which submission you feel comfortable with (meeting your domain of expertise, for example).
 - But, please try to first review submissions that have a low level of reviews (instead of reviewing the ones that already have a large number). The sooner you review, the more choices you will have.
 - If there are submissions that have not been yet processed, the co-chairs will assign reviewers. But we hope not to have to do so.
 - You should not review a submission if you believe you have conflict of interest (submission paper from someone in your company, or obviously from you, for example).
 - You may review as many submission as you like.
- We need to look into EasyChair to clarify how to assign reviewers.

Evaluation (1)

Once you have reviewed a paper, please submit your assessment in the EasyChair website using the **EasyChair online form**

This will allow other reviewers to be aware of the latest advancement of the reviews.

To evaluate your review, use the following ratings:

- 3: strong accept: Must be presented as a long talk
- 2: accept - Should be presented as a long talk
- 1: weak accept: Must be presented as a short talk
- 0: borderline paper - Could be presented in a short talk, if there is enough available slots.
- 1: weak reject; No real interest regarding the Workshop.
- 2: reject ; Paper is out of scope
- 3: strong reject; Paper is harmful for the WoT ecosystem

Evaluation (2)

You must mention your expertise regarding the position paper:

- 5: (expert)
- 4: (high)
- 3: (medium)
- 2: (low)
- 1: (none)

Please provide a detailed review, including justification for your scores (pro and cons), filling the two appropriate comment fields:

In the first field, provide comments that may be sent to the authors unless the PC chairs decide not to do so.

In the second field, provide confidential remarks for the PC only (not to be sent to authors).