

Group on Earth Observation User Interface Committee Meeting – Monday September 22nd through Wednesday September 24th, Boulder, Colorado, USA

Group on Earth Observation (GEO) User Interface Meeting September 24, 2008

Meeting notes for Day 3

Joint ADC/UIC Co-Chair meeting

The UIC and ADC were meeting for two hours. The meeting included the full UIC plus the ADC co-chairs. The intent was to conduct focused discussions and reach agreements on next steps.

Gary Foley provided an introduction to the joint meeting. The ADC participants included: Jay Pearlman, Ivan Petiteville, Ivan Deloach, Jiashen Zhang, Alessandro Anonni, Ben Burford, Doug Niebert, Steve Browdy, Ruth Duerr

There were introductions around the room, followed by discussions on the topics below.

1. a. The Requirements Registry - status and issues

Gary Foley – task US-06-01, UIC hoped to be done and secretariat was not able to fund it; Lawrence Friedl provided NASA funds; others provided support as well (Environment Canada, IEEE, European organization, etc)

Lawrence Friedl – We will have a lot more interactions between the 2 committees. Summary task for 0601 (see presentation); harvest what has already been done; currently available versus future plans for high priority earth observation data; what areas we have a good plan for versus areas which require action; observation parameters and characteristics; 9 step process for each SBA; advisory group for each SBA helps identify documents; analyst (1 or team) to review the documents; kick off telecon in October; ask GEO secretariat to request documents; will need to include developing countries; plenary report in 09;

Mike Tanner – tell us more about the documents

Lawrence Friedl – examples decadal survey; Japan plan, GMES reports; misc project reports (often including lessons learned); examples in water area

Mike Tanner – Comment: the US Geo assessment group had built a document in the past year that included a list of documents from around the world. It might be a good place to start.

Michael Brady – Will it be on the website?

Gary Foley – He is working on it, but does not have it yet

Mike Tanner – The US GEO assessment document is still not finished; it will be posted on USGEO.gov

Lawrence Friedl – When the call comes out, he encourages the ADC to provide sources of **documents** and serve on advisory groups.

Mark Cantwell – Are the analysts looking at documents from which they could infer user needs.

Group on Earth Observation User Interface Committee Meeting – Monday September 22nd through Wednesday September 24th, Boulder, Colorado, USA

Lawrence Friedl – We are going to have the analysts take as wide a perspective as possible. We expect some inferring at least initially.

Gary Foley – The effort is off and running; how can we link this with getting information into the registry; the intent is to take advantage of the Stresa meeting to run sessions for the analysts to collect information for each SBA; interested in getting advisors, if you are interested or know someone who will. He then turns over the floor to Jay Pearlman.

Jay Pearlman – They began discussions on the user requirements registry about 6 months ago. Doug Niebert will talk about it; Doug will indicate the first step in going forward is understanding what your needs are and how the registry will be used.

Doug Niebert – Hans-Peter Plag create a database for the Toronto workshop; linking ontology with list of observables to allow connections between requirements and observables. Two additions were made: the requirement registry in GCI, and the data base available for population; we still need to set up a standardized vocabulary for observables. We can make some changes to it to reflect your interests.

Ellsworth LeDrew: In the meeting in Toronto, we were looking at air quality as an example to do this work. We thought we would have some data entered into these fields. What evolved was more discussion on the tables and some need for revisions. We haven't been able to acquire the resources to make these changes. Do you have suggestions?

Hans-Peter Plag – We can have a more elaborate user interface with different tables, but still use a very flexible data model behind the database. We need more tables that are intuitive to the user. The discussion was not so much about the tables, but the data model. It is very difficult to do this work without funding and do it on your own time.

We need to see where we can get resources; we might be able to start with an existing structure

Gary Foley – Dave McCabe, Thierry Rauchin, and Michael Brady from UIC are involved in the pilots;

Jay Pearlman – We could identify a pilot for user requirements for one of these areas; if one is active and well enough funded, it could be used as an example

Doug Niebert – The registry needs to be exercised

Gary Foley – We have a possible next step; we will talk about the 3 pilots and see what can be volunteered

1. b. Resources for developing and maintaining content for the Registry.

Gary Foley - In looking at where we are, He appreciates the work of the ADC in developing the requirements of the registry, the next step is to test it and bring it into the US-06-01 based on what we learned in the pilots. We are hearing from the GEOSec that we are responsible for all the tasks and we need to work with the task leads and see if they are doing it or get them to do it. This will be a continual process for the life of GEO I don't have any answers re how are we going to maintain it. He is looking at the continued development of requirements. We will have to continue to develop and

maintain the registry and in a volunteer organization it is not clear how that will happen. In the short term, while he is still with EPA, he can provide small contractual support, but is not likely to contract with Doug's contractor. Does any one else has any other thoughts on that matter?

Lawrence Friedl – It sounds like if the UIC is involved in every task, then all task leads will have to come to the UIC to get signed off.

Mike Tanner – I do not agree with your description of the work plan. It is a user driven work plan that ExCon has asked for. UIC doesn't own every task. As we put together these task, we need to make sure these tasks are well understood and coordinated; we need a communication process that includes the UIC

Hans-Peter Plag – I think that there is really a need to better organize the task sheets and make them more descriptive. There needs to be a link between the user requirements and the task sheets. There needs to be a better link between the tasks and the work plan as the work plan does not describe the tasks.

Mark Cantwell – Same comment; include benefits

Michael Obersteiner – Last week there was a meeting in performance indicators, There was a document behind it with a logical chain: inputs, activities, output, impact. He has a strong feeling that task sheets should be done according to that plan

Steve Browdy – If there is going to be a registry, the UIC should closely manage the registry. The registry should be the common portal to put information in and take information out.

Lawrence Friedl – How does the registry account for the changing in requirements

Steve Browdy – You need rules and guidelines in a registry For example, when there is a modification to the standard registry, a notification is automatically sent out

Ivan Petiteville – There s a need for moderator and priorities setting

Gary Foley – The performance metrics and the outcomes that are likely to be produced could be a basis for prioritizing.

Jinlong Fan – We could put the user requirement on task sheets

Doug Niebert – He envisions that the database would be tightly controlled. It would not be a publicly available donation box and would have some moderation and would have a higher quality of information

Lawrence Friedl – UIC needs to get users actively engaged in using the registries; now we hear that is needs to be moderated, and not all requirements are equal

Doug Niebert – Publishers are users as well

Lawrence Friedl – This may be an issue of what our committees mean by user.

UIC is looking at it as decision makers who want to use GEO, not someone who puts data set in registry

Gary Foley – This is why we need the pilots

Ivan Petiteville – We need to consider all categories of users

Hans-Peter Plag – It is most important to support decision making. Should we talk to users about future needs and possibilities in 5 years based on technology advances? We need to moderate and facilitate the dialogue with users; may be UIC need to focus on those dialogues

Peter Colohan – It is impossible for the people in this room to gather requirements. They need to manage a process which the task leaders can carry out in their interaction with various classes of users

Group on Earth Observation User Interface Committee Meeting – Monday September 22nd through Wednesday September 24th, Boulder, Colorado, USA

Jay Pearlman – I would like to build on the comments from Peter. I would suggest the building of requirements is being done by many agencies. We could draw from this work. We would be building a central repository where countries could come and see what other countries are doing in gathering

Gary Foley – We need to continue the dialogue between UIC and ADC co-chairs on the relationship re the registry. UIC intends to include many of these comments in the comments to the work plan. Also UIC welcomes comments from the ADC in the work plan. For the implementation pilots, can we have a methodology to prioritize requirements? People who specify the requirements could indicate new outcomes that can be achieved as a result of implementing these requirements. This is a very valuable discussion, we have work to do and will learn by trying.

2. ConOps Documentation – The GEOSS Common Infrastructure (GCI) from a user perspective, presentation by G. Foley

Gary Foley – How do the users engage in using the GCI? Try it and provide feedback. When he tried it, he did not have a very good experience; he is not an experienced user of services and database, but knows applications. Typically, he uses Google to access applications which are relevant, and then tries to lay out how those applications can be used. He tried the same approach to GCI, and was not very successful. The best approach he recommends is to include a user point of view in the conop document, the point of view from less experienced user. These users look at data on charts; they do not know what services they need but can recognize data which they may be interested in. Another item: EPA registered the GEO data gateway; Gary cannot find it in either portal – did we do something wrong?

Mike Tanner – He will take an action; there may be an additional step, which someone from the secretariat may have to take

Doug Niebert – He checked; the EPA data gateway id in the registry but not in the portal

Ivan Deloach – We will need to simplify the process and create forms for the non-technical user

Gary Foley – He will be happy to discuss his inputs to the conops document

3. Best Practices Wiki - the roles of the Committees in populating and coordinating Wiki contributions. (There were Wiki presentations earlier in the UIC meeting.)

Gary Foley – Ruth gave a presentation; Hebert Humbolt worked through an example

Jay Pearlman – He wants to engage the UIC to expand and test the best practices wiki. Does the wiki concept work for GEOSS? A one year evaluation period is ongoing to identify if the approach will be enduring. This is the ADC perspective as UIC engages with the wiki. It needs to be populated, but this is not a massive campaign. We need expert editors – best practices are a global issue; look for a person in Africa, South America to engage.

Lawrence Friedl – During the breakout session, they looked at ways to sponsor special sessions at conferences, and for people to get on the wiki, the websites, etc; we will discuss special targets – things we may be doing to get people onto the wiki

Jay Pearlman – There is a workshop in Ghana where this could be tested in the short term. It is a hands-on workshop. The UIC could speak to the organizers.

Group on Earth Observation User Interface Committee Meeting – Monday September 22nd through Wednesday September 24th, Boulder, Colorado, USA

Osamu Ochiai – IOC; GEO committee needs more registration; workshops etc would be good

Gary Foley – We will be talking more about how the UIC can use the wiki. He thinks it would be valuable. There will be places for us to share the techniques we have used to look at the breadth of users that could be involved.

The ADC wants to have more discussion about the workshop in Stresa Italy.

Francesco Pignatelli – He is organizing a symposium in Stresa 4 to 8 May; the topic is “sustaining the millenium goals”. It is organized along SBAs. There is a session on digital earth. The UIC and co-chair and the organizer of the conference, thought it would be good idea to have the UIC meet there. We would also like to create a UIC session where people can register in the portal for each SBA. They hope ADC work matures between now and then to show good examples in air quality, and biodiversity

Jay Pearlman – Do you plan active hands-on workshops?

Francesco Pignatelli – We are just starting the planning. For example, we are discussing a thematic workshop on health. It is a good time to propose something. We will accept abstracts until November. NASA and ESA are sponsors. There will be over 40 projects from EC related to GEO

Gary Foley – He will encourage CoPs and IGOS themes to submit abstracts

4. The UIC perspective of SBA and CoP management - the relation between CoPs and SBAs,

Gary Foley – There is now a UIC web site on the GEO web,. It includes: about committees, meetings; documents. They are reviewing archives to load meeting documents and outcomes. In the section on about UIC, they plan to include CoPs and add links to their web sites, as well as description of all IGOS themes. He wants to annotate tasks with CoP and IGOS relevancy, and would like to add matrix showing these relationships, but the time is short. It is a big effort for UIC to show how to integrate CoPs, IGOS and tasks, and US-0601 task gathering requirements. They had a very productive discussion with CBC: who are the users, what do they do? A CBC member suggested to add one more question – do they know how to use the data? Requirement gathering could include gathering CB needs. There will be a joint call for participation from UIC and CBC from the point of view of user applications. It was a very productive week.

Brian O’Donnell – You mentioned IGOS themes and marriage with CoPs, and how to facilitate that. What about IGOS symposiums?

Gary Foley – We had 6 presentations on the IGOS themes. Many of the presenters laid-out where they were interested in linking with CoPs. They also indicated where they are conducting workshops. They asked CBC to have people on the planning committee

Jay Pearlman – He stressed the importance of having requirements for design from a user view point. The UIC work is very important. ADC needs user’s feedback in the products they generate. More user engagement in testing what we are doing. The requirements registry may not be the final need of GEOSS; looking forward,

Ivan DeLoach – It is very important to enhance our credibility of the process as we enhance the Initial Operating Capability (IOC). They will be looking at what is working and what is not, but the capability is only as good as the content. We need the countries

Group on Earth Observation User Interface Committee Meeting – Monday September 22nd through Wednesday September 24th, Boulder, Colorado, USA

and organizations to populate the GCI. Continue to reach out. We need a common understanding of what is expected in the work plan. There is a political need to see progress. We need to build upon that. If we do not meet the user needs we fail.

Jay Pearlman – He expressed ADC appreciation for the joint session, and recommended that ADC and UIC engage in a more routine fashion.

The joint session was concluded.

Full UIC reconvenes

Francoise Pearlman – She was asked to give a brief presentation on workshops. She has been helping to coordinate the GEOSS Workshops. There have been approximately 23 to date. She showed the workshop page on the ICEO website –ieee-earth.org. She showed workshops done to-date. Publicizing workshops sufficiently, and reaching a broad enough audience is a challenge: we need to improve the attendance. Maybe we could use this list to go back and reach out to the user community. She talked about the Ghana conference. The ITC is involved because they will do a lot of training. It is a three day workshop. The second day is specifically aimed at decision makers. The following workshop is in Valencia Spain. The focus of that one is much more architecture oriented. We are starting to plan next year's workshops. We will probably end up with between four and six 1 to 2 day workshops. We are trying to move away from informational to hands-on type workshops. We are a small team. We need your help

Peter Colohan – He wanted to make a clarifying remark: the work of UIC needs to be included in the work plan; he fully believes in the work of the UIC

Herbert Humbault – That is fine as long as the tasks are in touch with the users

Peter Colohan – We need to get to the task leaders; task is something concrete to work from

Michael Brady – Make sure the task leads are part of the advisory groups

Thierry Ranchin – Do you need specific actions to improve the collection of data

Peter Colohan – It is voluntary; all you can do is have a process and hope for the best

Report out from Breakout Groups

John Lyon – Water (see file Water-Breakout-report)

The group had a variety of comments. They tried to look at the larger questions, but did not focus specifically on water; participants included people who had been on GEO for a long time, and others who had been involved for less than 6 months. Discussion was chaired by John and Francesco, with focus on things which were achievable. They had a few presentations interspersed by discussions. Presentations will be on the web site. They want to make reference to the value and utility of the tasks.

Item 1. That information can be made available through links. Workbench to get the information out (why, whom, ...) and maintain it.

Item 2 . Work plan needs to articulate the role of the users and GEO committees in further engaging the users. Enhance task sheets.

Items 3. No answers

Item 4. Part of UIC work is in clarification, validation and tracking outcomes. Develop visual material showing the relationship between committees and processes. Leave terms of reference out. Recommend the tasks be assigned anew and clearly to GEO Committees

Group on Earth Observation User Interface Committee Meeting – Monday September 22nd through Wednesday September 24th, Boulder, Colorado, USA

Item 8. Use workshops as a way to engage users for several purposes

Discussion:

Mark Cantwell He addressed developing methodology to engage users – look at what is going on in the social sciences re how to engage the user community; terms of reference – at least make sure we are all on the same page.

Michael Obersteiner – we actually did that re social sciences; GEO has all the ingredients to not be successful; need to do some innovation

Lawrence Friedl - Health theme report-out (see file Health-Breakout-report)

General comments and UIC description

Proposed revision to the work plan – use of GEOSS for SBAs

Evolving role of UIC – include priorities and role working with other committees

Comments on users focus – current state of registry and portals in alpha version; need to work with early adopters

CoPs categories: some exist today because of GEOSS (energy CoP); CoPs outside of GEO (long range transport of air pollutants); CoPs that do not exist yet. Top down approach: create CoP on human health and infectious disease and invite people to join. Bottoms up approach: start from a specific problem; revise governance section in work plan. Use CoP vehicle to engage the users

Task management language – task leads are encouraged to get engaged with community of practice

Task sheet updates – to include reference to CoPs (push model)

Question about governance: CoPs need to focus on specific tasks, but not in analyzing surveys;

How to enable new CoPs to participate – use call for participation to help identify CoPs around specific issues;

Tasks from a user perspective which may need update: AR-09-01 – need to add language re involvement from UIC;

Possible creation of a new registry on applications of earth observations to decision making;

Socio-economic indicators – DA09-04; not sure why it is in the DA group; suggested rewrite; techniques to determine socio-economic benefits is not a one solution fit all; it needs to be specific to the user community – need to reword;

Interaction to other committees and excom – example of linkage between UIC, CBC, and ADC (do we need for each task to identify POC to ADC and CBC?)

UIC member involvement – do we have enough people on the committee to do that, and how do we track that; how about moderators for requirements registry

3 month time frame – material for workshops (infrastructure 101 for the user); work with ADC in developing material; distribute to attendees from previous workshops

4 to 6 months – Identify list of workshops

Over 12 months – engage users and call for proposals

Ellsworth Ledrew -Energy Group Presentation (see file Land-and-Energy-Breakout-report)

Group on Earth Observation User Interface Committee Meeting – Monday September 22nd through Wednesday September 24th, Boulder, Colorado, USA

The group expressed general dissatisfaction with the work plan and the description of tasks.

He walked through a powerpoint presentation outlining all of their recommendations.

Lawrence Friedl– Did you come up with specific language?

Ellsworth LeDrew – No it was useful that you did that. There are some meetings coming up where language can be generated.

Jinlong Fan – CoP is a hard term to understand. For the GEO work plan on one hand we have a CoP and on the other we have tasks. For some tasks they are already CoP. They are the same. For others they are different. We also mentioned that we wanted to make more CoP. If we can link the CoP with the tasks, then many one CoP can lead two or three tasks, and not separately.

Ellsworth LeDrew– I think that is consistent with what we are proposing. At the end of each task we want to list the appropriate CoP or CoPs. At any rate there should be a POC that could communicate with all involved CoP. We would like to see it more formalized.

Gary Foley– It would be better described throughout the work plan which is a lot of work and we are willing to undertake it but not by Oct 3.

Jinlong Fan – We have to make sure the IGOS – P themes are integrated.

Gary Foley – It is done, but the work plan doesn't show it.

Jinlong Fan- We need a process or period to make sure all activities/themes from IGOS-P are included.

Ellsworth LeDrew - At Toronto they all agreed that they were part of the CoP, but maybe some have different ideas of what it means to be a CoP. It is self-defining. Maybe we can revisit that with a presentation we have in our archives.

Francesco Pignatelli – In summary, in the new work plan proposal, we would like to add that on each task, there will be a task leaders, the link with the IGOS-P theme and to the CoP(s).

Ellsworth LeDrew – That is taking it a step further.

Francesco Pignatelli – I think that Jinlong's point is important. In the current version of the work plan there is no evidence that the IGOS-P themes have been incorporated. We need to define the CoP better. It is in our interest that this link be formal.

Ellsworth LeDrew – There is a list of CoP on our website. We need that more explicit in the work plan.

Thierry Ranchin – I would like to open up discussion on the three presentations.

Manfred Kloeppel – What will happen in next? The three reports will be brought to the attention of the C4 meeting and then what?

Gary Foley– I want to make sure everyone is comfortable with this. We have numerous options. We could take these three reports and combine them in a letter to the GeoSec on how to improve the workplan by Oct 3.

Mike Tanner – Actually we would need it in a week. We have a meeting. If you just give me the reports, I can put them together.

Gary Foley– Well we would like to consolidate them. If the committee is comfortable with the co-chairs generating a letter, we could do that. We could also bring them up to the C4.

Mike Tanner – The GEO Sec's meeting is Sept 30, next Tuesday

Group on Earth Observation User Interface Committee Meeting – Monday September 22nd through Wednesday September 24th, Boulder, Colorado, USA

Thierry Ranchin– I noticed a few points to share. I think these two and half days were fruitful. I think the organization of the week was new and something we should do again. It fostered the communication between the committees. I want to stress the Streza meeting and I think the UIC should be there. I think we understand the importance of US-06-01-and 02. I want to stress that we saw achievements from the CoP.

The meeting was adjourned.

Joint CBC/UIC co-chairs meeting

Participants: Lawrence Friedl, Imraan Salooje, Joao Soares, Thierry Ranchin, Yolanda Berenguer, Vojko Bratina, Marta Angoloti, Benjamin lamptey, Hilcea Ferreira, Carrie Stokes, Gordon Bridges, Andiswa Mlisa, Francesco Pignatelli, Tumisang Sebitloane ,

Marta Angoloti – She discussed Agenda: call for participation; task US-0601;

Call for participation (CFP)

Lawrence Friedl – We need both committees to provide comments

Therry Ranchin – We need to ensure common objectives

Jao – We need time to review

Marta Angoloti – Short feedback: they were going to do another call for participation; this is tool for getting projects we want to focus on from a user perspective; summary – happy with the proposal; could add additional criteria; complementary action; trying to get funding to create consortium of organizations (not to fund the projects themselves); we can complement each other completely; 2 or 3 person from CBC helping you

Lawrence Friedl – We want to hear from the end users who want to apply the data; we could group projects with similar ideas into CoP; also this would be a way to help GEO understand better what observation needs users have

Imraan Saloojee – There is no need to duplicate the effort from a CB stand point

Lawrence Friedl – If the first one is successful, we would do it again and again. What SBA is more critical?

Marta Angoloti – What do you call success?

Lawrence Friedl – 4 things: 1) getting call issued; 2) getting proposals especially from developing countries; 3) getting funding; 4) getting success stories (result is interesting to the end user; increase user basis)

Jao – Start with one SBA ; too difficult to start with all 9

Lawrence Friedl – We are thinking about starting with 3 areas

Imraan Salooje – From the GEO secretary perspective, the process should focus on the new work plan

Lawrence Friedl – We should we try to release this before the plenary

Marta Angoloti – It would be good to have the groups involve from the beginning

Andiswa – The proposal process takes too long

Carrie Stroke – It is dangerous to put out a call for proposal if you do not have money to back it

Marta Angoloti –It need to be clear in the call that funding is not guaranteed; keep the proposal simple

Group on Earth Observation User Interface Committee Meeting – Monday September 22nd through Wednesday September 24th, Boulder, Colorado, USA

Andiswa – Make it an expression of interest instead of a proposal

Marta Angoloti – The idea is to gather information about the user, not details about the project

Lawrence Friedl – We will cut down the proposal; we need experts from UIC and CBC (for example from CoPs) to improve the projects designs

Thierry Ranchin – ADC's call for participations had no funding and received a lot of answers; there were iterations between the committee and the proposing organizations
Lawrence Friedl – you mentioned the CFP with the donor organizations; what do you want them to do?

Andiswa – Donor can provide feedback

Marta Angoloti – We would like to do it

Thierry Ranchin – There are specific ways to do contracts in Europe versus US

Imraan Salooje – there is sufficient commonality to look at this more closely; look at the review of the document;

Thierry, Marta will be the POC for CBC; they will identify a contact from UIC

Next topic – US 06-01

Lawrence Friedl – We have finally started our process; we have identified a POC for each SBA. We will form an advisory group (12 people or more) for each SBA to identify documents especially from developing countries. We will need help from CBC to identify documents and people to participate in the advisory group. The approach will be regional; if you have CBC POCs for each major regions, this would be helpful. Also a letter will be issued (from GEO secretariat) requesting help from countries and participating organizations.

Imraan Salooje – UNECA is an important contact point for Africa; they have done a fair amount of work across most SBAs; expertise from committee itself Chris from ITC in the water area,. We should be able to provide you with names of people for SBAs

Lawrence Friedl – When we have a list of participants for the advisory board, we can share it with you.

Lawrence Friedl – We are planning one telecon with just the analysts in Octobe. The energy analyst is ahead of the curve and is already having telecons with his advisory group; some teams are further along than others. We will send you the current status on each team

Andiswa – What kind of documents are you looking for?

Lawrence Friedl – We are looking for all kinds. Here are some examples: reports from workshops, documents from major governmental organizations, reports from projects. They need to be publically available documents, which can be referenced

Imraan Salooje – The space application study document would be a good source; there is also an NSF study on CB for Oceans and coasts; GCOS is more development oriented

Andiswa – Newsletter archives contain a lot of information re what the country (Kate XXXX)

Lawrence Friedl – Some of the documents which may be 5 or 6 years, may have been updated; the analysts will check with the issuing organization, if further information is available. The above is a great suggestions. In addition, having CBC members as part of the advisory group may facilitate identifying CB requirements

Group on Earth Observation User Interface Committee Meeting – Monday September 22nd through Wednesday September 24th, Boulder, Colorado, USA

Marta Agnoloti – Does the secretariat have a list of all the CB members who could be contacted for these tasks?

Imraam Salooje – He has a list and will make it available

Lawrence Friedl – US-0601 is not in current version of the work plan; we think that it is being corrected and may come up at the C4 meeting; it deserves a presence in the work plan; there should be wording identifying it as a cross- GEO activity

Francesco Pignatelli – The discussion for the last hour encourages participation in CFP; we need the visibility

Imraam Salooje – On the second point, the work plan development and target identification need synergy; that is the reason to accelerate the targets identification; the work plan and targets will be re-aligned; Alexia, the work plan coordinator is also involved with the targets

Francesco Pignatelli – Is it possible to identify targets in 4 to 6 months?

Imraam Salooje – Targets are at a high level

Francesco Pignatelli – The work plan gets updated every year; after targets have been finalized, there will be alignment if needed;. The work plan does not get finalized until after plenary (in Jan time frame)

Francesco Pignatelli – The work plan is a working document

Francesco Pignatelli – There is a lot of work in progress for the plenary; there is a need to align indicators, targets, and work plan

Marta Angoloti – Regarding the first part CB0701a, engaging donors; all agree in having that task in the first part of the work plan; we need to involve all of the CBC and all of GEO; it is a transversal task. We cannot leave it, just to a task team to implement; there is a concern re how to track and follow up this task; the solution was as follows: we will keep the paragraph about task where it is; the implementation of Seville road map will be a task itself to keep the visibility

Francesco Pignatelli – we do not understand why recommendations are not taken into account

Imraam Salooje – all comments were taken very seriously; had a lot of discussion; making those tasks subtasks, was strengthening those tasks; from CBC perspective; engaging donors was the responsibility of the entire committee with reporting responsibility being at the plenary; there are different levels of tasks. At this stage, he will take comments back; he did not see section 1 as not being part of the work plan

Francesco Pignatelli – The above explanation is probably right, but we need explanations regarding the process and providing more transparency

Imraam Salooje – The table with all of the comments and disposition has not come forward; the work plan brings all CB tasks under one heading

Francisco Pignatelli – It is very positive to have all committees together; that message should be given to the secretariat

Jao – It would be good to do this kind of meeting once a year

Imraam Pignatelli – IGOS-P

Francesco Pignatelli – IGOS-P is transitioning to the CoPs. But this is not visible in the work plan; it would be good to include all participants via link (CoPs and others)

Thierry Ranchin – We need to involve them and find out how they can involve us in this collaboration

Imraam Salooje – CoP are referenced, but that may not be as specific as desired

Group on Earth Observation User Interface Committee Meeting – Monday September 22nd through Wednesday September 24th, Boulder, Colorado, USA

Francesco Pignatelli – He wants to know the participants (User Interface section?)

Imraan Salooje- The information is in the task sheets; we need seamless on line system for work plan, and task sheets

Thierry Ranchin – not all Cop are covered

Imraan Salooje – This is a good and robust discussion

Francesco Pignatelli – How can we involve users; one way is during workshops; there is a JRC symposium in Stresa in May 08 – topic along SBA; there is plenty of room for CBC to participate; there are parallel sessions for users; it is a good opportunity for more mature areas – work with ADC to show case some thematic areas; abstract are due in November

Lawrence Friedl – The symposium focus is applying earth observation; they would like participants from developing countries; they could get users together to share what they have done;

Yolanda Berenguer – She had a proposal for similar activity; this is the best way to promote earth observation and engage the users

Francesco Pignatelli - Read the list of topics in the symposium flyer

Yolanda Berebguer – Where does funding come from, JRC?

Francesco Pignatelli – JRC will put some organizational money, also ESA and NASA; JRC may put some money for developing countries

Lawrence Friedl –there will be training sessions on how to use earth observation; he could provide training material

Imraan Salooje – He mentioned the CB portal and IEEE workshops

Joao - Thank you for your time

The joint session was concluded.