

GSNL SAC meeting 9 October 2015

Minutes of Meeting

Place: Remote Webex teleconference

Date/time: October 9th, 2015, 16:00 to 17:40 CEST

A. Agenda

ID	Discussion item
1	Approval of new Supersite evaluation procedures
3	Assessment of Hawaii Supersite biennial report
3	Update on new Supersite and Natural Laboratory proposals
4	Discussion and possibly evaluation of the Corinth Gulf Supersite proposal
5	Presentation of GSNL as a Flagship initiative in the new GEO Workplan
6	Update on issues on data infrastructures
7	AOB

B. Attendees

Name
S. Salvi
C. Meertens
S. Zerbini
F. Amelung
F. Haslinger
M. Cocco

C. Attached Documents

Document Name	Reference/Filename	Notes
New procedures for Supersite selection and review	Supersites Selection-Review Procedures_2015.pdf	
New proposal for Greek Supersite	GSNL_Proposal_for_Permanent_Greek_Supersite-20151009_Submitted.pdf	
Biennial report for Hawaii Supersite	Hawaii Supersite Biennial Review Report November 2014.pdf	

D. Discussion

Discussion item	Discussion Summary
	The meeting starts at 16:10 CEST.
1	<p>SS summarizes the background of the procedure document and the latest steps carried out for its definition, including the CEOS DCT revision.</p> <p>FH raises the issue of the proposal submission templates not being fully compliant to the requirements; some instructions given in the templates on the data access sections are not clear enough. He volunteers to modify the templates and suggests to vote for document approval, since the changes are minimal.</p> <p>The SAC votes to approve the new procedures. All members approve.</p> <p>SS to wait for FH to provide the corrections and then to request GEO the publication on the GSNL website.</p>
2	<p>The SAC discusses the Hawaii Supersite biennial report submitted by M. Poland. Stefano summarizes the very good results obtained by the Supersite, and outlines some critical points and suggestions which are marked in the report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The timeliness of data distribution is crucial to ensure the best use of the new science during the delicate phase of emergency response. It should be improved for Radarsat data. 2. There is a need for a standardized set of procedures to access SAR data. 3. A Supersite-specific archive for optical data would be recommended, for instance based on the USGS HDDS system. 4. High resolution DEM data would be important for the Supersite. 5. Further COSMO-SkyMed data would be needed for a better monitoring of the volcanic areas. 6. Funding would be needed to improve the Hawaii Supersite website, to provide access to data and scientific results. 7. Scientific collaboration, and even the simple communication of the results obtained by each team is lacking. 8. The little to no coordination/communication between science teams makes difficult for the PoC to assemble comprehensive reports <p>These issues are common to other Supersites, and are being addressed by SAC, some already in the new selection criteria.</p> <p>Thus the SAC positively evaluates the Hawaii Supersite biennial report. SS will communicate the result of the review to the CEOS DCT, to ensure continuation of the EO data provision.</p>
3	<p>SZ provides an update on the Straits of Messina Supersite proposal. She is waiting for actions from INGV.</p> <p>SS provides an update on the status of the SEANLab proposal. SS has presented the proposal at the CEOS WG Disaster meeting in September, receiving in general more positive feedbacks than in the last WG meeting in Tokyo, but some agencies wanted to have a more clear look at the amount of data requested. SS asked the proposers to provide a new version with more clear data requests, this is now under CEOS DCT</p>

	<p>evaluation.</p> <p>The SAn Andreas proposal has never been re-submitted. SS has asked Brenda Jones (USGS) to investigate what the issues are on this regard.</p>
4	<p>The SAC briefly discusses the just submitted proposal for a Greek Supersite. The effort to issue an official MOU among the proposers is appreciated, since it demonstrates the will to commit to data provision, although the methods are not well specified. There are however negative comments on the lack of international community involvement in the proposal, which is presented by only Greek scientists. Moreover there is surprise in not seeing the National Observatory of Athens involved in the proposal, since it is the main monitoring agency for seismic and volcanic hazards in Greece. After a brief discussion the SAC decides to give the possibility to the Coordinator to revise the proposal before sending it out for review.</p> <p>SS to contact the Coordinator.</p>
5	<p>SS gives an update on the new GEO transitional workplan for 2016. After a brief discussion there is agreement to propose the GSNL as a Flagship activity, according to the new definition of activities in GEO.</p> <p>SS to prepare a proposal together with the PoCs of the Supersites and to circulate it to the SAC.</p>
6	<p>SS gives an update on the data infrastructures for the Supersites. The update is partial since none of them (beyond Hawaii) has yet submitted a formal report.</p> <p>The Iceland S. has developed a portal to share several different data types, it has been presented at the EGU, but it is still not public. In early November SS and CM will participate to the Futurevolc User workshop and will receive updated info on the status of the infrastructure.</p> <p>The Etna and Campi Flegrei S. are still developing the infrastructure, which should be ready by early 2016.</p> <p>The Marmara S. does not plan to have a separate infrastructure for data distribution. The European Supersites however, do provide open access to their EO and in situ data on request.</p> <p>No info is available yet for the Ecuador and Taupo, NZ Supersites.</p> <p>SS reports on the ESA-ASI activity to provide COSMO-SkyMed data on the GEP. It seems that it will be operational for the Nepal data by the end of the month, and for all Supersites a bit later.</p> <p>FA and CM ask whether the GEP will also be able to host old COSMO data now in the UNAVCO servers, and provide access to DLR data too, so as to have a single point of access to the Supersite EO data.</p> <p>SS to ask ESA and to invite P. Bally to the AGU Supersite splinter meeting to present the GEP.</p> <p>FA reminds SS to verify the possibility to obtain TanDEM X DEMs on the Cotopaxi volcano (Ecuador Supersite). SS to verify what is the status of the amended proposal of the Ecuador S. in which the DEM was requested.</p>
7	<p>Meeting ends at 17:30</p>

E. Actions list

Discussion item	Action Description	Action ID	Responsible (Company)	Due Date
1	Wait for FH to provide the corrections to the selection procedure templates and then to request the publication on the GSNL website.	A1	SS	10/2015
2	Communicate the result of the Hawaii Supersite review to the CEOS DCT,	A2	SS	10/2015
4	Contact the Coordinator of Greek Supersite to request amendments.	A3	SS	10/2015
5	Prepare the GEO Flagship proposal and circulate it to the SAC.	A4	SS	10/2015
6	Ask ESA and invite P. Bally to the AGU Supersite splinter meeting to present the GEP.	A5	SS	10/2015
6	Verify what is the status of the Ecuador S. amended proposal.	A6	SS	10/2015