

GSNL SAC meeting 4 April 2016

Minutes of Meeting

Place: Remote Webex teleconference

Date/time: April 4th, 2016, 16:00 to 18:40 CEST

A. Agenda

ID	Discussion item
1	Evaluation of revised proposal for a Greek Supersite
2	GSNL Implementation plan for GEO
3	GSNL Data Policy, initial discussion
4	AOB

B. Attendees

Name	Nickname
S. Salvi	SS
C. Meertens	CM
S. Zerbini	SZ
F. Haslinger	FH
M. Cocco	MC

C. Attached Documents

Document Name	Reference/Filename	Notes

D. Discussion

Discussion item	Discussion Summary
	The meeting starts at 16:10 CEST.
1	SS solicits participants to raise remaining issues with the proposal for the Greek Supersite, whose revised version was distributed to the SAC members on March 23rd. SZ notes that the main Greek geophysical monitoring agency (NOA) is still missing from the core team.

SS says that the proposer explained that NOA was invited to participate but declined. He reminds the SAC that he has written to NOA President, NOA-GI Director, and GEO Greek representatives, asking them to consult with the ITSAC to find a solution satisfactory for all sides, but he received no further official information from them on the results of this negotiation.

He says that the absence of NOA from the initial Core team is very unfortunate but since it is not clear that there is a scientific reason for NOA to declining participation, the SAC should continue to evaluate the proposal in its scientific merit.

FH points out that it should be more clear that the data provided to the Supersite are open to the entire scientific community, since the proposal requests registration to access the data.

SS replies that the registration to a Supersite data portal is acceptable, since it is one of the ways used to keep track of the participants for management purposes. Since the Supersite coordinator cannot refuse registration to any scientist, the data are actually open to the entire scientific community (including NOA).

SS notes that the SAC recommendation to include the international community in the preparation of the proposal " to define shared objectives, challenges, data needs", has only been partially fulfilled. The proposers sent several letters of support from foreign colleagues, but the Core team is not including foreign scientists. He says that this is not a reason for turning down the proposal, since all the scientific objectives were addressed and other scientists' work was properly acknowledged. However, GSNL does not only promote data sharing but also international collaboration, and the actual involvement of the international community should be verified periodically, as specified by the new evaluation procedures. He reminds that the failure to fulfil the commitments by the Core team implies the loss of the Supersite status.

MC declares a possible conflict of interest with the proposal, for his role in EPOS, and says he will not take part in the decision on the Supersite acceptance. However he points out that the proposal is still not clearly describing how the data will be shared. The use of the GSNL website stated in the proposal is not feasible. He points out the need to show sustainability for the Supersite data infrastructure, and he wonders why the EPOS European infrastructure is not mentioned as a likely service provider for data sharing.

CM notes that there are no institutions in the Core team using GSAC and suggests that GSAC could help the team to share geodetic data.

After prolonged discussion it is decided that the revised proposal should be submitted to the entire SAC for voting, according to the GSNL [decision making procedure](#). Given the partial compliance to the SAC recommendations and Supersite requirements, the Greek Supersite could be accepted as a Candidate Supersite, to be evaluated and possibly confirmed as Permanent Supersite after two years, according to established procedures. Moreover, the Supersite acceptance is conditioned to the following amendments to the proposal:

1. The proposers should write down in Section A.7 a clear statement describing how the in situ data will be shared (which infrastructures will be used in the short term and what is the plan for the next two years). They should indicate if the data will be eventually available through EPOS. They should also make their data discoverable through GEOSS. They should identify the partner institution(s) responsible for providing the access for each type of data (may not necessarily be the data owner).

	<p>2. The proposers should declare that the MoU among the initial partners (the Core team) does not imply any restriction to the data access for the Supersite scientific community, and does not imply any limitation to the collaboration among scientists of the Supersite community.</p> <p>The MoU seems to have the goal to provide a formal commitment to provide data to the Supersite and to set internal rules for coordination and management. Thus the proposers should clearly state that the MoU is open to participation of other scientists/organisations who want to provide their data to the Supersite.</p> <p>3. The proposers should increase their SAR data requests, since the planned bimonthly acquisition rates is not sufficient to ensure adequate multi-temporal coherence levels for inter-seismic crustal deformation mapping. They should request one image per month for Radarsat 2 and 16 days for X-band data. They should also increase the coverage to monitor the most active faults in the area. They should also request all archive imagery available for the area. We remind to the proposers that also Pleiades and SPOT 5 data are available to the Supersite initiative through CNES.</p> <p>4. When mentioning the "Greek Supersite Cluster" in section A.8, the proposer should specify that some of the EO data provided by the CEOS agencies are to be used only for scientific research, and private companies will respect this obligation.</p> <p>The SAC Chair will start the ballot procedure after this MoM has been approved by the SAC.</p>
2	<p>SS informs the SAC members that he is writing the Implementation plan for the GSNL 2.0 initiative, as requested by GEO. The GEO Programme Board will approve the initiatives submitted for the new work plan, in early May, after the GEO Symposium in Geneva.</p> <p>He explains that GSNL is not fully compliant to the formal requirement for a Flagship, since it does not have a Policy Mandate from an international organisation. However the single Supersites are normally coordinated by local institutions/agencies which do have national mandates for providing scientific support to Disaster Management agencies.</p> <p>At the same time, since for most Supersites there is not a stable national funding framework, it is difficult to plan the activities in a detailed way.</p> <p>The plan will be circulated by mid April.</p>
3	<p>SS says he is drafting the GSNL Data Policy to be adopted by Supersites. Given the presence of national laws limiting data sharing in some countries, the Supersites will have the possibility to modify the Data Policy to be compliant with such local conditions.</p> <p>FH suggests to use the post-2015 data sharing principles being implemented by GEO, slightly modifying the original principles.</p> <p>The SAC agrees.</p>
	Meeting ends at 17:40

E. Actions list

Discussion item	Action Description	Action ID	Responsible (Company)	Due Date
-----------------	--------------------	-----------	-----------------------	----------

1	Start the ballot procedure for the Greek proposal (email to all SAC members).	A1	SS	4/2016
2	Communicate the result of the ballot to the proposers, conditioning the Supersite acceptance to the requested amendments.	A2	SS	4/2016
4	Circulate the Implementation Plan draft	A3	SS	4/2016
5	Complete and circulate the GSNL Data Policy	A4	SS	6/2016