

**Management Committee Meeting****April 18 2003, 09:30-18:00****Genova, InfoMus Lab****DIST Università di Genova**(Revision 0.2 January 28, 2004)**notes taken by Nicola Giosmin**`nicgios@miu-ft.org`

## 1 Introduction

On the 18th of April 2003, the Cost287 - **ConGAS** MCM took place with the following participation of delegates:

- Nicola Bernardini, Italy
- Thomas Hermann, Germany
- Andy Hunt, UK
- Daniel Arfib, France
- Gunnar Johannsen, Germany
- Antonio Camurri, Italy
- Nicola Giosmin, Italy
- Roberto Bresin, Sweden
- Kia C Ng, UK
- Sylvie Gibet, France
- Marcelo Wanderley, Canada
- Sophia Dahl, Sweden
- Jan Tro, Norway
- Rolf Inge Godoy, Norway
- Lauri Savioja, Norway
- Valery Vermeulen, Belgium
- Klaus Scherer, Switzerland

- Sergi Jordà, Spain
- Gualtiero Volpe (Camurri's replacing delegate), Italy

and the following guests:

- Giovanni De Poli
- Matija Marolt

The meeting was held in Genova in the DIST-Infomus department (viale Causa 13, Genova, Italy).

## **2 Reading of the 10/03/03 Minutes**

Bernardini reads the minutes of the previous meeting. All delegates agree unanimously.

Johannsen proposes to draft the next meeting minutes listing the different activities in different titled paragraphs.

Hermann proposes to change the expression "graduate students" with "postgraduate students" in the last page of the minutes. All delegates agree unanimously.

Hunt proposes to list, in the next meeting minutes, the final decision in separate paragraphs. All the delegates agree unanimously.

## **3 Introduction of new delegates**

Bernardini introduces some new delegates (Camurri, Wanderley, Gibet, Scherer, Vermeulen, Jordà) and the guests.

Each delegate make a short presentation about his/her role and interests inside Cost287 - **ConGAS**.

## **4 Organization of activities for 2003, Budget Administration**

Bernardini proposes to speak about budget. The amount of money for the period from 01/07/2003 to 30/06/2003 is about 54000 euros. He proposes to subdivide 1000 euros per country for administrative expenditures. He proposes that the Consortium would organize one workshop in the period from April 2003 to June 2004. He states that a workshop costs about 10-15000 euros.

Arfib points out that the participants will be paid only for the real days of job. He proposes to join a Cost287 - **ConGAS** workshop with the next MC meeting.

Bernardini proposes to use one day for the MCM and another day for the internal WGs meetings. He proposes to organize them during other international meetings: SMAC, Wedelmusic,

Resonance, DAFx. He proposes also to decide before the number of MCM in order to allocate money.

All the delegates agree unanimously.

Hermann asks if the next meeting is going to be split in two days, as said.

Bernardini answers affirmatively. He adds that there is also a budget invoice for seminars. He proposes to link it to the STSM.

Arfib asks if the seminars will be open or closed.

Bernardini proposes to do them in both ways. He asks the delegates if they approve to organize only a MCM.

All the delegates approve.

Bernardini asks what to do with STSM.

Hunt asks if it is really necessary to give suggestions about STSM at the present moment.

Bernardini answers that the delegates can think about it. He points out that in the Cost287 - **ConGAS** website the complete STSM request form will be soon available.

Hunt asks if it is possible only to organize the workshop during the current meeting.

Gibet points out that it would be important also to discuss about STSM.

Wanderley suggests to make some white papers between Cost287 - **ConGAS** delegates.

Hermann proposes to put money into STSM because they are a crucial point into a Cost287 - **ConGAS** project.

Bernardini stresses that he agrees with all these proposals, but that it is important also to study the better way to implement the STSM.

De Poli underlines that usually the STSM are useful above all for the students training.

Bernardini notices that another budget voice is "publication". He stresses that it is important to make a really balanced budget (balanced between STSM, workshops, seminars, publications, secretariat, etc...). He suggests to make the budget only after the private WGs meetings in the afternoon. He proposes to allocate 300 euros for the publication (for a small flyer) and about 8000 euros per WGs per year.

All the delegates agree.

Godoy suggests to have a link in the website for the researchers interested in participating in Cost287 - **ConGAS**. This link will be related to a database containing software, relevant documentation, etc.

Bernardini points out that the secretariat will put the web-site online, but that would be better that the contents to come from delegates, because of their expertise. He proposes to focus on MCM and the WGs' meetings. He suggests:

- 1 MCM for April 2004, combined with WGs' meetings

- 1x3 WGs' separate meetings: they could be seminars, or workshops, ecc. linked with STSM

Arfib asks if it is better to organize the MCM before or after the WGs' meetings.

Wanderley suggests to organize first the WGs' meetings and then the MCM, in order to be all informed about the decided strategies and the work done before, by the WGs.

Bernardini points out that there will be also transversal WGs: one devoted to the realization of a book containing the main results of the Cost287 - **ConGAS** project, one dedicated to the setting up and management of the website (contents and technical parts), another responsible for the dissemination strategy, etc. He underlines that the secretariat could be in charge to follow all the transversal WGs, but he points out that it would be better if there would be a head for each transversal WG.

Scherer asks what is the WGs agenda. Due to the fact that there is no agenda up to this meeting, he suggests to define a basic agenda for the future. He notices that the delegates has no good models in order to articulate WGs and transversal WGs. Furthermore he thinks that a transversal WG should work on a more structured database than a classical WG.

The meeting breaks for 10 minutes.

## 5 Final Definition of WGs

Bernardini proposes to define better the WGs, in a definite denomination.

Wanderley proposes also to make a mapping of them.

Arfib discusses about the meaning of "gesture". He points out that the WG1 should clarify it.

Camurri asks for an evaluation process.

Bernardini answers that each WG should evaluate their work.

Johannsen notices that the WG1 is more rich and interesting than all the others.

Bernardini agrees and suggests to find a definition to put into the website. He proposes that the WGs should be named as follows:

- Gestural Analysis WG
- Hardware WG
- Software WG

Ng suggests the following names:

- Gestural Analysis WG
- Input WG

- Integration/Application WG

Camurri suggests the following names:

- Multimodal Gestural Analysis WG
- Gesture Modelling WG
- Integration/Application WG

De Poli suggests that, before finding a denomination it is important to find the topics: people would meet in particular topics. So he suggests to start from the bottom: first to join people around a general topic, and then to build the WGs.

Bernardini agrees but asks if someone is really interested into the hardware part of the project.

Hunt underlines that Fernstrom and Bongers are really interested, but unfortunately they are not present.

Wanderley suggests to call the WG2 "Input technology".

Finally Johannsen suggests the following names:

- Capture/Analysis methods and modelling
- Input technology
- Integrated applications

Some delegates express the wish to put in the next MCM agenda the discussion of a call for participation text about CONGAS. All the delegates agree.

## **6 Introduction of Transversal WGs - TWGs**

Bernardini points out that the following point is related with how to build the transversal WGs. He proposes the following:

- Book TWG
- Website TWG
- Standards TWG
- Dissemination TWG

Bernardini says that it is better to have a head of unit for each TWG. This will build the TWG in a more efficient way.

Scherer points out that Cost287 - **ConGAS** generally, needs to carry on a kind of activity whose principal aim is to give more impetus into current research in the field gesture-sound control. He stresses the need of new instruments that will help interdisciplinarity: he suggests that Cost287 - **ConGAS** should provide for these instruments in the end.

Camurri agrees and suggests to present the results of WGs in workshops open to the public.

Bernardini speaks briefly about his experience in Tempo Reale: he looked into current research problems and then organized a workshop to take the first step towards the solution of it.

Scherer agrees and suggests to involve people able to draft clear tutorials mirroring the current state-of-the-art in this field. Then he suggests to work in deep contact with musicians in order to know what they really want to use dealing with sound and gesture.

Johannsen underlines that the chairmen of WGs and of TWGs should make report during the MCM.

Tro notices that it is possible to collaborate with some existing european conferences in order to invite experts useful for the project.

Bernardini summarizes the final denomination of the WGs:

- Gestural Analysis methods technology
- Gestural Input technology
- Integrated applications

He also proposes the following TWGs:

- Web-site
- Book
- Standards
- Dissemination

The meeting stops in order to allow separate WGs meetings.

A brief summary of the different WGs chairpersons follows. The different WG reports are by: Arfib (WG1), Ng (WG2), Hunt (WG3).

## **7 Next MC Meeting**

The delegates discuss about the organization of the next MCM. They propose to organize it towards the end of 2003, if possible in Barcelona. The delegates also discuss about the possibility to organize it for June 2004.

Final proposals:

1. next MCM will be held towards the end of 2003, in Barcelona
2. next MCM will be held in conjunction with different WGs' meetings and TWGs' meeting
3. some STSM will be organized before the MCM
4. the budget will be proposed via email by the chairman
5. the voting of different issues via email is approved by all delegates (using the different mailing lists stated in the previous meeting)