

Minutes of TC 1.2 Meeting, Eindhoven, 30.06.2016

Members present at the meeting: see Appendix

1. Technical part

Introduction of Members (present at the meeting)

Presence/attendance sheet sent out to all members attending

Appointment of the meeting secretary – Dr. Ivan Tyukin appointed as a secretary of the meeting

2. Membership

Professor Fouad Giri speaks about composition of TC 1.2 (see Agenda). F.G. clarifies senior roles of TC 1.2 and announces Vice-Chairs

- A. Annaswamy (Adaptive Control)
- E. Rogers (Learning Systems)
- A. Fradkov (Education liaising)
- E. Lavretsky (Industry)
- C. Freeman (TC Media-Liaison)
- T. Gibson (Social Media)

F.G. spells out criteria for selection of new members that account for excellent scientific and fair geographic, gender, and age (generations) representation in the society

A. Fradkov asks when new members can be selected. F.G. clarifies that this is usually done in the year of the Congress, just after the event.

3. Reorganization of web pages

F.G. speaks about current progress/state. F.G. asks members if having a dedicated Education Section would be helpful.

A. Fradkov suggests to fill the website with material relevant for adaptive systems:

- Presentations of talks related to “hot topics”
- Presentations of talks related to education/having educational value
- Promote educational edge in the community

A.F. asks to promote adaptive control in international graduate schools of control and promote the schools themselves. A.F. suggests to introduce Young Author Award.

M. Polycarpou supports young students award idea. I. Tyukin suggests to focus on students. F.G. asks how to define who is a student. A. Pogromsky proposes to set the content filter related to material presented in their PhD thesis; he also suggest to define a person up to right after defending PhD as a student. F.G. suggests to considered everyone within 3 years of defending PhD as a student for the purposes of the award. A.F. proposes that only those who are students at the time of submission are eligible.

4. Participation of TC members in World Congress 2017

F.G. speaks

A.P. suggests to invite Tom Oomen, from the university of Eindhoven, who active in learning control systems to become a member of TC 1.2.

A.F. asks about titles of the proposals displayed. A.F. asks why some have been submitted to Robotics (if they have done so, and this is not an administrative mistake).

A.P. agrees to clarify this issue.

5. ALCOSP/PSYCO 2019 venue proposals

F.G. announces that three declarations of intention have reached the TC chair in the following chronological order:

- Françoise Lamnabhi-Lagarrigue, venue : LSS-SUPELEC, University of Paris Sud, Gif-sur-Yvette, France.
- José Rodellar, venue : Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain.
- Eric Rogers, venue: University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

F.G. suggests to wait for formal proposals to arrive.

A.P. says previous ALCOSP/PSYCO was held in France.

F.G. says that it is too early to discuss proposals as they have not been yet formally submitted.

M. Polycarpou asks if the procedure for selecting the venue has been formally defined and made clear to everyone involved in advance? He asks to clarify the procedure.

F.G. says that decisions at the meeting are more transparent and informative since the proposers have a chance to make a formal presentation and all attendees have an opportunity to discuss the proposals. Voting by e-mail has disadvantages. Suggests a compromise – to allow both ways (by e-mail and at the meeting) but apply larger weight to votes expressed at the meeting (for instance 2:1).

A.P. suggests to vote at the meeting.

A.F. agrees with M.P. and suggests to vote during the meeting. As EUCA member, he shares his experience on how the selection of the venue for ECCs is made. There are no formal criteria. Selection is done by voting among attendees of the EUCA meeting after listening to all proposal presentations and discussion (in 2016 it was even anonymous voting). As for the content of the proposal presentation the rules are as follows: "There is no required format for the bid presentation, though it should include information about usual major aspects of hosting a conference (e.g. committee chairs, venues, outline budget, city info, hotel and transport options etc). "

M.P. proposes to make the selection criteria publically available.

A.P. asks to create formally a single ALCOSP/PSYCO event for the purposes of optimizing running costs and management of the conferences.

F.G. says that there will be visibility implications for merging the two.

F.G. asks about necessity of PSYCO for this TC: are we interested to organize PSYCO within the remit of this TC?

A.F. asks what's the number of accepted papers for PSYCO, and hearing the number suggests to continue to support PSYCO at this TC.

A.P. says that ALCOSP/PSYCO is an established brand, and that PSYCO should remain independent. He asks to postpone a decision to a later date.

A.P. says that after Toulouse the calendar looks already busy. He suggests to decide on the date of the event before the 2017 Congress.

F.G. says that the date is to be decided at the Congress. 2 years before the event is not too close, and that IFAC regulations state that the date can be decided as late as 12 months before the event, and that they can be modified at a later stage.

A.P. asks to give more freedom to organizers regarding choosing exact dates of event in future.

F.G. says that it is in fact possible to change dates.

F.G. discusses a proposition to remove/rebrand "signal processing" in ALCOSP. He says that changing PSYCO, however, is strategic.

A. Fradkov says that similar discussion occurred nearly a year ago with ENOC conference (a conference with long history but its official title starting to lose edge). A decision was reached to keep the acronym but call it differently.

ALCOSP/PSYCO – keep the brand but call it differently.

M.P. – it is not clear why ALCOSP must be tied with PSYCO. The name must make sense to people from outside.

A.F. suggests to discuss this by e-mail.

M.P. voices a concern that there are no clear/obvious benefits from changing the name by dropping SP from ALCOSP.

Appendix. Members present at the meeting

Tarek Ahmed-Ali, ENSICAEN, Caen, France

Boris Andrievsky, Inst. Probl. Mecha. Engineer., Saint Petersburg, Russia

Stanislav Aranovskiy, INRIA, Lille, France

Alexander Fradkov, Inst. Probl. Mecha. Engineer., Saint Petersburg, Russia

Igor Furtat, Inst. Probl. Mecha. Engineer., Saint Petersburg, Russia

Fouad Giri, University of Caen Normandie, France

Yoshihiko Miyasato, The Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Tokyo, Japan

Alexander Pogromsky, University of Eindhoven, Eindhoven, NL

Marios Polycarpou, University of Cyprus, Cyprus

Ivan Tyukin, University of Leicester, UK