

SeaDataNet – Split – Sep 2014

Advisory Board Report

## **General Remarks::**

1. We appreciate the overviews at the start of the meeting and during topics to summarize status.
2. AB sees presentations once a year. So details that project members know we do not. So we have questions but time for those was limited. We need this time. (I will include these in written report)

## **Accomplishments:**

### **A) Important to hear data centre's challenges this year.**

We heard about data flow procedures carried out at some centres. This is always good to hear.

**B) Technology improvements:** A very interesting session today and quite impressive results. We are happy to see the collaboration with ODIP for example.

**C) Capacity building:** We heard about the course conducted at IODE PO and happy to see the quite high approval ratings.

## Challenges:

A) **Varying degree of configuration, capacity and connectivity:** This is still evident and we wonder if in the SDN final report there will be something like a spreadsheet showing which partners use which tools. This has important consequences in sustaining SDN infrastructure beyond project end. **(a Forum to match up people with similar issues to share and develop solutions.)**

B) **Legal governance and risk management.** The AB is concerned that it saw no proposal for this at this meeting. We were expecting some document that laid out a draft plan. We understand that the EU has asked for ideas, though not required this, and to us this seems a great opportunity to influence your destiny after the end of SDN (see later comments)

**Plans to respond if one a key node stops functioning.** We did not see any discussion of this, but we still encourage thought and an appropriate level of documentation from the key centres.

C) **The AB reminds SDN that WP8.9 has a deliverable at month 28 of standard(s) to be submitted to the IODE/JCOMM Ocean Data Standards and Best Practices, ODSBP.** - See later.

## **Top three priorities:**

**A) Strengthen communication with user communities:** We saw a presentation on the publications generated by SDN. This is a good thing. But we are concerned that publication pages are passive – they do not actively reach out and in particular this is not likely to be found by groups in society that are not aware of SDN at all. - more later

**B) Further steps to transition from manual to automated processes:** We saw some discussion of this – more later.

**C) Continued development of best practices and interoperability:** We see this as evidenced by ODIP cooperation. But we are concerned that the standards deliverables have slipped. We noted Oct 2014 is the projected milestone for these submissions. I suggest you add the unit conversion algorithms embedded in ODV aggregation.

## **Additional comments:**

1. Development of monitoring statistics has come a long way since last meeting. We encourage the development of “high level” ones to show impact. Suggestions include – how many CDIs are distributed in calendar quarters (yearly?) represented as a percentage of the total CDI holdings at the end of that time period. Provide mean time to deliver data requests (time request delivered – time request made). Number of requests for data made by and delivered to agencies outside of SDN.
2. In the final SDN report we suggest that there be a section that describes what work has been accomplished that exceeded the original project proposal.
3. The cooperation between ICES and JCOMMOPS appears not to have really started (and should include NV?). Our impression was that the two groups will still laying out initial positions. Since the contract started last March, we expected to see more coherence.

## **Additional comments (2):**

4. The EMODnet-Physics discussion raised concerns for what was not said. So, we did not hear the connection that was being made to SDN infrastructure. In private discussions we heard that such work is more evident in the other EMODnet projects. This is good and we encourage closer integration of the RT and delayed mode so as to properly exploit SDN infrastructure.

5. The EMODnet “path” appears to be the accepted means to support into the future what SDN has built. But the funding model apparently is different. We did not see a discussion of this, and we expected this to pop out of the legal and risk management discussion.

6. We understand issues around restricted data. Good to see in products session the percentage restricted is low. We hope that a sustained SDN infrastructure carries out a regular questioning of if restricted data can be made public.

## **Additional comments (3):**

7. The AB was impressed by the metadata inclusion now in ODV.be concerned and helpful in some way. And the progress towards SensorML and SOS.

8. At the end of SDN, we still have concerns that all members will be able to sustain what has been built. This is partly a national issue, but the EC should also.

9. As noted each meeting, the functionality of SDN can support not simply science, but spatial planners, consulting companies and other groups in society at large. Reaching out to these groups to “educate” them about SDN will strengthen national support and advocacy for sustaining what has been built.



## **Additional comments (4):**

10. We noted the inhomogeneities in spacial and temporal distributions in regional product data files. Is there a common strategy across regions to deal with common problems?

11. Encouraged to see very high percentage of correctly flagged data in regional product data files.

12. One of the strengths of SDN has been the multinational coordination. A successful continuing support of SDN will have a “coordinating committee” to keep the collaboration up. Is there opportunity for EC support for this?