

Evaluation Summary Report

Proposal : 318126
Acronym : SPHERICS
Program : FP7
Call : FP7-ICT-2011-8
Funding scheme : Small or medium-scale focused research project -STREP - CP-FP-INFSO
Duration : 36 months
Activity : ICT-8-1.4 - Trustworthy ICT

SPHERICS

Security Personal Helper based on Enhanced Reputation, Identity management and Cryptographic data Storage

Proposal submitted by :

N°	Proposer name	Country	Total cost (€)	%	Grant requested (€)	%
1	FRAUNHOFER-GESELLSCHAFT ZUR FOERDERUNG DER ANGEWANDTEN FORSCHUNG E.V	Germany	859,000	19.23	675,250	23.13
2	NEC EUROPE LTD	United Kingdom	916,392	20.52	499,129	17.10
3	UNIVERSIDAD DE MURCIA	Spain	540,800	12.11	408,240	13.98
4	UNIVERSIDAD DE MALAGA	Spain	535,200	11.98	404,000	13.84
5	THALES RESEARCH & TECHNOLOGY (UK) LIMITED	United Kingdom	756,096	16.93	388,157	13.30
6	PORTUGAL TELECOM INOVACAO SA	Portugal	427,192	9.57	217,700	7.46
7	MOVATION AS	Norway	431,338	9.66	326,733	11.19
	Total		4,466,018	100%	2,919,209	100%

Abstract :

Many recent incidents have shown that users' data at service providers is insecure when the providers are attacked or exposed by malicious insiders. In addition, user accounts are not secure when it comes to targeted hacking or social engineering attacks, due to widespread existence of weak passwords or password reuse. The rapidly increasing number of Internet services makes it impossible for users to judge the trustworthiness of those services or providers. The goal of SPHERICS is to significantly increase the users' security and privacy in the Internet by offering an intermediate element, called the Security Personal Assistant, which empowers users to control their sensitive data in a unified way. In particular, the assistant will be based on a unifying approach of integrating trust and reputation management, identity management, as well as cryptographic data protection. SPHERICS will apply the assistant to today's most discussed use-cases from cloud computing, social networking and e-government, which are challenging the current state-of-the-art technology. SPHERICS will use identity management as the key element for enabling end users to maintain control of their authentication information and their personal attributes. This creates a homogeneous way to access different Internet service providers with minimal user intervention. The identity management will link to an easily accessible trust and reputation management system that allows selection of different service providers either by the user or automatically. It will be based on end users' past experiences with service providers and reports about the service providers from other entities. Secure data storage and processing allows sensitive information to be released in a way that is secure against compromised Internet services. Such techniques empower end users by letting them take control of the security of their data in the Internet, without having to rely on the service providers' integrity.

Evaluation :

1. Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call) (Threshold 3.0/5 ; Weight 1.00)	Mark:
---	--------------

<p>The proposal's objectives in creating a user-centred tool for managing security and privacy are clearly expressed and address an important and challenging problem. The objectives regarding user-friendly applications of multi-party computation are less clearly explained.</p> <p>The current state of the art is well covered in the area of interface design for identity management. However, coverage is less good in secure storage and trust and reputation management. The proposal does not sufficiently address the flaws in existing solutions.</p> <p>Limited progress beyond the state of the art is described in the area of identity management. The advantages conferred by the proposed progress in secure data storage and processing are not clearly explained. This is a significant weakness.</p> <p>The technical approach is in general sound, although the focus is more on the methods that will be employed than the functionality of the tool that will result.</p> <p>The work packages and relationships between them are described with the aid of diagrams, but these do not convincingly explain how the results from work packages 3, 4 and 5 will be integrated. The objective of seamless data portability is not adequately supported in the work plan.</p>	<u>2.50</u>
---	-------------

<p>2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management (Threshold 3.0/5 ; Weight 1.00)</p>	Mark:
<p>The management structure is appropriate for the proposed work and procedures are comprehensively covered and clearly explained. Project risks are appropriately addressed.</p> <p>The individual participants are of high quality and all have relevant experience and expertise.</p> <p>The consortium as a whole is broadly appropriate for the proposed work. However, it is not clear from the proposal that the consortium includes the expertise required for the design and development of the trust and reputation aspect of the Security Personal Helper.</p> <p>Overall resource allocation is excessive in view of the limited technical results expected from the proposed work. Non-personnel costs are not justified in sufficient detail.</p>	3.50

<p>3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results (Threshold 3.0/5 ; Weight 1.00)</p>	Mark:
<p>Achieving the objectives of the proposed work has the potential to contribute to the expected impact listed in the work programme of helping users make informed decisions on the trustworthiness of ICT. The potential impact in this respect is significant as there is a number of strong industrial partners in the proposed project. However, the scientific impact of the proposed work is limited in view of the low degree of innovation it includes.</p> <p>Dissemination plans are of high quality.</p> <p>High-quality exploitation plans for the research-oriented participants are described, but exploitation by industrial participants is less convincing. The strategy for future product development and code maintenance beyond the end of the proposed work is not clear.</p> <p>Intellectual property rights matters are appropriately addressed.</p>	3.50

<p>4. Remarks (Threshold 10.0/15)</p>	TOTAL:
<p>The proposal falls below threshold on the first criterion as well as overall.</p>	<u>9.50</u>

<p>Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention? (If yes, please complete an ethical issues report form (EIR))</p>	N
---	---

For each criterion under examination, score values indicate the following assessments. Half point scores may be given :

0- The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information

1- Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2- Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.

3- Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.

4- Very Good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.

5- Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.