



GROOM

Gliders for Research, Ocean Observation and Management
FP7-Infra-2011-2.1.1 "Design Studies"

Deliverable D1.2

1st Advisory Board meeting minutes

Due date of deliverable: 30/09/2013

Actual submission date: 10/02/2015

Partner responsible: UPMC

Classification: PU

Grant Agreement Number: 284321

Contract Start Date: October 1st, 2011

Duration: 39 Months

Project Coordinator: UPMC

Partners: UPMC, OC-UCY, IFM-GEOMAR, HZG, AWI, UT, FMI, CNRS, IFREMER, HCMR, NURC, OGS, UIB, NERSC, CSIC, PLOCAN, SAMS, UEA, NERC.

Project website address <http://www.groom-fp7.eu>

Table of contents

I. Introduction	3
II. Advisory Board members	4
III. Advisory Board at the 2nd GROOM General Assembly.....	5
IV. Other Meetings with Advisory Boards Members	10

D1.2

I. INTRODUCTION

In the DOW of the Grant Agreement, the proposed advisory board functionality for GROOM was organized into two boards:

The scientific Advisory Board was constituted by experts and Scientific Coordinators of similar projects, in relation with the different domains of GROOM. Their function was to advise the consortium, to ensure a wide and varied communication thus ensuring a cross-feeding of results. This board had also to help assessing the progress of the project and to provide advice on new directions and opportunities for innovation in order to ensure the relevance of the project's results to the need of the external European and international bodies.

This Policy Board was constituted by Policy Makers of the EU involved Countries and some official persons of organisms and groups implied in RIs policy. They should use the project results as a basis for discussion and eventual new decision. This board had also to help preparing a conceptual design report showing the maturity of the concept. One has to keep in mind that this report would be useful for policy bodies (such as ESFRI) for implementing roadmaps for new infrastructures of European interest.

It was rapidly clear that this distinction was somewhat theoretical and that merging the two boards into a single Advisory Board (AB) was more efficient. In addition, initially one meeting per year and per board was planned. But since the initial reporting schedule with 3 yearly period has been changed to two periods of 18 months, the resulting schedule became of two main AB meeting organized together with the general assembly of the project. These changes have been acknowledged by the Project Officer, resulting in only one deliverable for each reporting period for the new (AB).

The consultation with the AB members was mainly done during the two general assemblies at the end of each reporting period. However, meeting with the relatively high numbers of members at a single place and time, was soon identified as difficult and expensive. So several on purpose individual meetings have been organized between the Scientific Coordinators, Laurent Mortier and Pierre Testor, as well as meetings during national or international conferences or events relevant to gliders, observing systems or research infrastructures, such as the 2nd International Conference on Research Infrastructures in Athens (ICRI2014 <http://www.icri2014.eu/>).

This report presents

27/06/2013

GROOM website address <http://www.groom-fp7.eu>

D1.2

- the minutes of the 1st AB meeting during the 2nd General Assembly of the project, where an effort was done to gather US and Australian members of the AB in order to foster collaborations of GROOM with the glider communities in these countries,
- and a summary of the others meetings with AB members.

II. ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

The 20 members of the GROOM Advisory Board are:

Dr. Ralf BACHMAYER, Canadian Centre for Ocean Gliders (CCOG)

Dr. Vanessa CARDIN, OGS – Member of EMFO and EuroSITES

Dr. Charles ERIKSEN, University of Washington

Dr. Patrick FARCY, IFREMER - Scientific coordinator of JERICO

Dr. Patrick GORRINGE, EuroGOOS Deputy Director

Dr. Pierre-Yves LETRAON, IFREMER - Scientific coordinator of EuroArgo

Dr. Kostas NITTIS, Hellenic Centre for Marine Research, Institute of Oceanography

Dr. Mary Jane PERRY, University of Maine

Dr. Michele REBESCO, OGS – Member of EUROFLEET

Dr. Uwe SEND, University of San Diego, Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Chairperson or member of GOOS, JCOMM, Observations Programme Area (OPA), Observations Coordination Group (OCG), Data Buoy Cooperation Panel (DBCP), OCEAN Sustained Interdisciplinary Timeseries Environment observation System (OceanSITES)

Dr. Oscar SCHOFIELD, Coastal Ocean Observation Lab, Institute of Marine and Coastal Sciences

Dr. Roger PROCTOR, IMOS eMarine Information Infrastructure, University of Tasmania

Dr. Zdenka S. WILLIS, Director of US IOOS Program Office, NOAA

Dr. Michael THORNDYKE, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Kristineberg, University of Gothenburg, Member of EMBRC

Tim HAIGH, Head of Group – GMES, European Environment Agency

D1.2

David MELDRUM, Vice chair, JCOMM OPA (WMO/IOC)

Pierre BAHUREL, chair of MYOCEAN

Damien PERISSÉ, in charge of Marine Research of the Conference Of Periph. Marine Regions

Albert FISCHER, Head of Ocean Observations and Services section, IOC/UNESCO

Florian CARRÉ, European Affairs, Pole Mer Méditerranée (French Mediterranean Marine Cluster)

III. ADVISORY BOARD AT THE 2ND GROOM GENERAL ASSEMBLY

GROOM 2nd General Assembly convened in the Hotel Riviera and Maximilians's near Trieste (Italy) on the 4th and 5th of June 2013. The following seven members of the AB were present:

Dr. Charles ERIKSEN,

Dr. Ralf BACHMAYER,

Dr. Roger PROCTOR, who made a presentation of the ANFOG/IMOS Australian glider facility,

Dr. Zdenka S. WILLIS, who made a presentation of the IOOS/NOAA,

Dr. Patrick Farcy, who had to leave at the end of the 1st day to join a JPI-Oceans RI meeting on the next day in Brussels,

Dr. Michele REBESCO, from OGS, also representing EuroSITES on behalf of Vanessa Cardin from the same Institute,

Dr. Patrick GORRINGE, who made a presentation of EuroGOOS and EMODNet.

After the scientific presentations and poster session during the GA, the AB members presented their feedbacks and recommendations to the project during the session of the GA. Some written contributions were sent after the GA. The feedbacks and recommendations are the following:

D1.2

Dr. Uwe SEND

- Congratulated the project on its achievement, in particular for the capacity to go from 1 glider 10 years ago to over 80 gliders now,
- Emphasized the importance of a single agreed global data format, and the setup of a working group between the BODC, Coriolis, IMOS and IOOS,
- Emphasized the importance to know the true cost of sustained glider observations and of glider pools: total FTE and total cost per glider-month, including infrastructure, data QC, losses, etc. (This assessment is currently being done by GROOM (Deliverable 5.7) but only very preliminary results were presented during the GA),
- GROOM contributed to demonstrate the improved maturity of the technology and of the operating teams by tracking the detailed percentage of deployment successes and of glider losses, including the diagnostics on failures (type, severity, ...),
- Encouraged to make sustained (endurance) lines/sites truly 100% occupied (e.g. Balearic Channels only have 120 glider days/year),
- Emphasized the importance to better explore and to document trade-offs for sensor choices (endurance, operating cost, etc.),
- Emphasized the importance to explore, to test and to document all options for in-situ sensor calibration (attach sensors/controller or glider to CTD rosette, ...)
- Emphasized the criticality to better document the complementarities between gliders, moorings, remote sensing (e.g. task 2.1 – showing which platform addresses which requirement best). It is essential to show that a mix of technologies is needed both for research applications and observing systems, including ship-based work.

Dr. Zdenka WILLIS

- Complimented GROOM and its advancement of Glider organization within Europe. She said: "It is very impressive to see how the number of gliders has grown, the recognition of gliders as an important ocean observing platform and the cooperation that has been demonstrated over the past year of GROOM".
- Appreciated that we have taken the time to explain the difference between EGO and GROOM, EGO being like a community of practice at the global level and GROOM

D1.2

being the design study of an European Glider infrastructure. She recommended to continue to closely link the two efforts and communicate the role of each.

- GROOM provides a wonderful opportunity to complete a design study properly. It is outstanding that the program also offers demonstrations with gliders. She strongly recommended that the surveys are completed and that the true cost of the infrastructure is documented and the business work flow process is diagrammed. Input to the surveys by all members is critical.
- Documentation of the efforts, while always the least favorite, is critical to the long term success. She warned to keep a vigilant eye on the documentation process.
- GROOM is taking great care to show the synergies between gliders and existing ocean observing platforms and is embarking on critical analysis tools. This is extremely important because the funding pressures are such that optimization will be necessary. She recommended that GROOM continues to show the value of an overall optimized observing system. In the present fiscal climate, the question that will get raised is "why do we need other types of observing systems": GROOM is doing well by up front addressing compatibility as to avoid competing between observing systems and thereby angering other communities.
- As Gliders are a platform that can cover many missions, this presents challenges to easily focus the glider mission. US IOOS is struggling with this, as it writes the US National glider plan. IOOS and GROOM can work together to identify those science questions and operational requirements that gliders can meet. This can serve to strength our common message on the need for gliders.
- Data management is key. Between GROOM, IMOS and IOOS, there is a unique opportunity to harmonize the NetCDF global format and advance BUFR (Binary Universal Form for the Representation of meteorological data) format for the GTS. US IOOS is committed to provide personnel to work on the NetCDF and funding has been committed already on the design for BUFR. IOOS welcomes the endorsement by GROOM and IMOS to work together. She said: "We should have a goal of harmonizing this within the next 6-8 months". She recommended the right small set of personnel meet face to face for a 3 day meeting to finalize the template. "If we can get the technical folks in the room as the same time, dedicated to this effort, I suggest we will be much more efficient in completing this task than months of emails, and phone calls".

D1.2

- Recommended GROOM keeps pushing the edge on sensor technologies for gliders.
- US IOOS looks forward to continuing our engagement. She Said: "I had a chance to talk with Agnès Robin (Agnès Robin is GROOM PO and also at DGRI Unit B4 for Research Infrastructures) after the meeting and thank her for supporting the GROOM effort. The fact that the EC is performing a design study with money to test gliders is really wonderful and a model for the world. I was on a telecom with Albert Fischer (IOC/UNESCO) today on the GOOS Regional Alliances (GRA) as I chair that council and he was keen to get my thoughts on the meeting".

Dr. Patrick GORRINGE

- As shown in his presentation, EMODnet Physics is collecting and making European data available and visible from different platforms, mainly physical parameters, via the EuroGOOS ROOS data portals. EMODnet and EuroGOOS are most keen to add glider data to the existing systems and regional networks.
- He asked for clarifying the plan for GROOM in regards of data dissemination of GROOM data through this portal. If GROOM need/want a data portal in addition to the RT dataflow through Coriolis, EMODnet Physics would be most happy to assist and add any GROOM related physical data to the current EMODnet Physics portal and brand it as "GROOM data", add a GROOM logo, etc. i.e. having a GROOM data portal within the existing EMODnet Physics portal.
- Stressed the fact that adding and making available GROOM data to the EMODnet portal and following the ROOSs regional structure would with no doubt raise awareness of GROOM activities and allow potential new users to find and explore glider data.

Dr. Ralf BACHMAYER

- Emphasized the importance to allocate more resources to the network optimization problem, in particular by using Kalman filtering.
- Emphasized the need for a closer work with manufacturers to better assess what is really needed by the users (and technologically feasible). In addition, this will avoid that big companies dictate their approach.

D1.2

- Recommended that GROOM put more emphasis on Nordic areas such as the Beaufort Sea, to better address the "ice" challenges for glider navigation.

Dr. Charlie ERIKSEN

- Complimented for the good level of cooperation within GROOM partners.
- Commented the respective benefits of centralization versus a distributed approach. In particular, the distributed approach is more appropriate to better satisfy needs and objectives of the users. And also a way to avoid stifling creativity!
- Insisted on the need for better quality insurance on the accuracy of the data.
- Recommended to go toward longer glider missions.
- Recommended that GROOM partners do the Seaglider refurbishment themselves.
- Recommended to identify common scientific problem to be solved together (Mediterranean General circulation, Eastern boundary problem, etc.). In particular, the Mediterranean is perfectly suited for a GOOS pilot case.

Dr. Roger PROCTOR

- Recommended to improve GROOM answer to the question "How to engage stakeholders?".

Dr. Michele REBESCO

- Pointed out the complementarities between EuroFleet and GROOM:
 - Participation of GROOM to EuroFleet General assemblies,
 - Common definition of "managing labels",
 - Sharing of deliverables, for example concerning the operation of gliders from R/V, including the case of glider damages where R/V can intervene (emergency recovery),
 - A common effort to manage metadata and RT data could enable better cooperation between common R/V missions and glider missions.

IV. OTHER MEETINGS WITH ADVISORY BOARDS MEMBERS

1 - First International symposium Marine Sciences and European Research Infrastructures, 28/06/2011, Brest, France

For the record, this was the first official presentation of the GROOM project. At that time GROOM Grant Agreement was under negotiation, and the project started 2 months later. Contacts with several future AB members (Z. Willis, M. Thorndyke, P. Favalli, J. Binot, P. Bahurel, R. Proctor) were established during this symposium, as well as contacts with stakeholders such as the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions of Europe (CPMR), Waddah Saab from the European Commission, DG RTD (Marine RI working group), ...

2 - 6th GEO European Projects' Workshop (GEPW-6), 07/05/2012, Rome, Italy

Meeting with Paolo Favalli (EMSO) and first contact with G. Pappalardo, from the ESFRI ENV SWG

3 - MSI-TSM 2012 Workshop, 13/11/2012, Toulon, France

Meeting with Jacques Binot from EuroFleet. First contact with J.-F. Masset from SeaERA who was conducting a mapping exercise on Marine RIs

4 - Building a Network of European Innovative Marine Clusters, 05/12/2012, Brussels, Belgium

Meeting with Florian Carré, from PoleMer Méditerranée

5 - SeasEra 2nd Pan-European Strategic Forum, 06/02/2013, Brussels, Belgium

Meeting with Florian Carré, from PoleMer Méditerranée