

**Environment Research Funders' Forum**  
**UK-Environmental Observation Framework**  
**Management Group Meeting (5)**  
**24<sup>th</sup> March 2009**  
**Defra, Ergon House**

**Attendees**

Ian Davidson (Chair)	Defra (am only)
Peter Costigan	Defra
Steve Aston	DOE NI
Keith Porter	Natural England
Andy Shaw	NCEO Strategy/ BNSC (from 1pm)
Lawrence Way (Chair from 1pm)	JNCC
Bruce Truscott	Met Office
Cathy Johnson	DECC
Frances Collingborn	NERC
Tom Leatherland	SEPA
Ron Stagg	SG
Richard Walmsley	EA
Mary Barkham	Head ERFF Secretariat
Beth Greenaway	UK-EOF Programme Manager
David Lister	Consultant UK-EOF Data Project
Gemma Truelove	UK-EOF Observations Coordinator (Minutes)
Andrea Leedale	ERFF
Clare Curwen-Jones	UK-EOF (Observer)

**Apologies**

Michael Schultz	NERC – replaced by Frances Collingborn
Richard Evans	WAG
Kathryn Raymond	WAG
Shaun Russell	WAG
Doug Wilson	EA – replaced by Richard Walmsley
Paul Mason	GECC Observations group chair
Helen Sellars	Forestry Commission
Susan Ballard	ERFF Communications Manager

**Papers for the UK- EOF 5th MG 24 March 2009**

- Paper A** Minutes of the last meeting and actions
- Paper B** Progress and updates to the UK-EOF programme
- Paper C** Income and expenditure in Yr 1 08/09 inc. co-funder's agreement
- Paper D** Confirming funding and budgets allocation for yr2 (09/10)
- Paper E** Data Sharing Vision and proposal
- Paper F** The interim Environmental Observation Catalogue
- Paper G** Assessing Suitability
- Paper H** Data Solutions Workshop 25<sup>th</sup> June 2009
- Paper I** Towards a 'Statement of Need' and next steps.
- Paper J** Calculating our Investments in Observations WS4a
- Paper K** Financial Mechanisms' WS4b – EA, Met Office and SAHFOS case studies

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

- 1.1 The chair welcomed members to the 5<sup>th</sup> UK Environmental Observation Framework (UK-EOF) meeting. Apologies were given and there was a tour de table to introduce new members.

He was pleased to welcome Cathy Johnson who would be representing DECC as a new member organisation on the management group. Ron Stagg was welcomed as the new representative from the Scottish Government and Frances Collingborn and Richard Walmsley joined the group for this meeting only, replacing Michael Schultz from NERC and Doug Wilson from the EA respectively.

- 1.2 The chair emphasized that this was an important stage of the project, moving from theory to practice and reinforced that it was essential that MG members embed actions from this group within their organisations or the programme could fail.

- 1.3 The main areas for the discussion were:

- Progress since December
- The Statement of Need
- The Data work – policy, catalogue development and data suitability study
- The Financial mechanisms workstream

## **2. Update and Progress (Papers A, B, C and D)**

### **Paper A: Minutes of the last meeting and actions**

- 2.1 The minutes were agreed as correct with one action arising. Regarding action 7, Mary Barkham had discussed the issue of whether UK-EOF should be badged as an LWEC activity with Andrew Watkinson and sought the views of the group. The group agreed that whilst the recommendations from the UK-EOF would be essential input into LWEC in informing priorities for evidence collection, it was not necessary to badge UK-EOF as an LWEC activity.

### **Paper B: Progress and updates to the UK-EOF programme**

- 2.2 The MG were asked to reflect on the past work and futures plans (including the pinch points identified) of the secretariat, as detailed in Paper B, and to give any comments on the how realistic members felt that these plans were.
- 2.3 Beth Greenaway gave an overview of progress with the 5 workstreams and details of major activities. Some activities had slipped in relation to the plans in December. The development of the metadata catalogue had been delayed to allow expert input from the newly created Data Advisory Group with the view to developing a better eventual end product. The workstream 4a investment study (to report a revised estimate of the UK's spend on environmental observations to Bob Watson) had also been set-back due to delays in obtaining information from the first group of organisations.
- 2.4 Beth went on to describe the plans for the first UK-EOF Strategic Analysis to be reported to the ERFF Main Board in November 2009. This would be a short 15 page document detailing the reasons that the UK observes the environment, the questions about the environment that need investigating and an analysis whether and how close the UK is to having the evidence required for these purposes.
- 2.5 For the analysis a series of workshops would be needed to investigate evidence requirements and the UK's current portfolio. It would also require MG organisations to produce adequately detailed costs for environmental

- observations and for progress to be made in workstream 4b in highlighting the barriers to long-term funding for observations.
- 2.6 The group would be required to attend at least one of the workshops and to identify themselves as chairs for these events where appropriate. They would also be required to attend management group meetings in both September and October to approve the analysis and then to fully discuss the summary document for release.
  - 2.7 The secretariat will require extra resource to carry out this work and had detailed plans to appoint another Band 6 (NERC)/HSO (Defra) in order to do this which would be discussed further in relation to papers C and D.
  - 2.8 The MG agreed that the analysis was a critical deliverable within the timescale given in order to be able prove the value of the UK-EOF and maintain support for it both within the community and at senior governmental level e.g. Bob Watson.
  - 2.9 All agreed that it would be a significant challenge to mobilise the required resources within organisations and that this was a significant risk to the production of the analysis but that it had to be prioritised within organisations.

#### **Challenges with Providing Information for the Strategic Analysis**

- 2.10 It was noted that overall little progress had been made collecting cost or environmental observation activity information (see later papers). The chair reiterated that whilst the secretariat could facilitate this work it was the responsibility of member organisations to ensure that their information was submitted in time and to the required detail that was agreed by the management group. The problem was highlighted that whilst management group members had cascaded actions within their organisations, those staff completing returns were not aware of, or engaged with, the aims of the UK-EOF.
- 2.11 It was agreed that the UK-EOF secretariat should simplify the guidance for submitting information and find a method of highlighting to staff the key messages and information required by the UK-EOF both in the short term to report to Bob Watson and in the longer-term to feed into the strategic analysis (details in discussions of Papers F and J).
- 2.12 It was agreed that the management group organisations should seek to embed the aims of the UK-EOF within their Delivery Plans therefore highlighting this work as a strategic priority and ensuring delivery and success of the programme to the benefit of all involved. This would be discussed at the ERFF Main Board in April.
- 2.13 The chair summarised the discussion stating that all had agreed to the plans detailed within Paper B, particularly to the delivery of a strategic analysis in November 2009 and that the secretariat and management group organisations should move forward to complete the actions on them to ensure delivery of the information required within the given timescales.

**Action 1: UK-EOF secretariat to proceed with plans for the strategic analysis to be delivered in November 2009.**

**Action 2: Secretariat to update the Delivery Plan with the new milestone chart by 7th April 2009**

**Action 3: MG members to ensure that they cascade the guidance to the correct people and ensure that the deadlines are met.**

**Paper C: Income and expenditure in Yr 1 08/09 inc. co-funder's agreement**

- 2.14 The UK-EOF income and expenditure for the 08/09 financial year as detailed in Paper C. It was noted that most co-funding agreements have been returned and contributions received and the group was thanked for returning these to the secretariat.
- 2.15 There will be some changes to the co-funding agreements following ongoing discussions with the Environment Agency regarding the issue of liability for risk. Management Group members would be forwarded this redrafted document for comment when this had been completed.
- 2.16 The under spend in the UK-EOF budget in 2008/09 was due to various including staff issues, delays to workstreams and the fact that several tendered pieces of work had come in under budget.
- 2.17 The management group were asked to note and agree the UK-EOF accounts to February 2009. No further comments were given, the accounts were agreed.

**Paper D: Confirming funding and budgets allocation for yr2 (09/10)**

- 2.18 The planned budget allocation for the UK-EOF in 2009/10 was discussed. Most organisations had now submitted their letters confirming their contributions to the UK-EOF in 2009/10.
- 2.19 It was noted again that the Forestry Commission would be changing its contribution to the UK-EOF in 2009/10.
- 2.20 The secretariat will raise invoices for these contributions in the next Financial Year.

**Action 4: Secretariat to raise invoices in the next Financial Year Sec. Deadline May 1st 2009.**

- 2.21 The 2008/09 under spend of £162, 284 will be carried forward and the overall budget for 2009/10 will be £612, 284. Table D2 showed the proposed allocation of the budget. Other plans included the proposal to employ an additional Band 6/HSO staff member for the secretariat and to contribute 5K to a new GEOSS post at NCEO.
- 2.22 The management group were asked to return a copy of the co-funding letter confirming their organisation's contributions for 2009/10 if they had not already done so.

**Action 5: All management group organisations to have submitted a co-funding letter confirming their contributions to the UK-EOF for 2009/10 by April 3<sup>rd</sup> 2009.**

- 2.23 The management group were asked to agree the proposed allocations across the workstreams for 2009/10. Given the serious issues organisations had had dedicating resources to respond to UK-EOF requests for information and the crucial importance of this to the success of the programme it was important to explore whether and how these resources could be spent to embed action towards UK-EOF aims within organisations member organisations. The chair committed to discussing this with Beth Greenaway.

**Action 6: Beth Greenaway to meet with Ian Davidson to discuss resource allocation in relation to ways of embedding/ resourcing UK-EOF work within member organisations by 31<sup>st</sup> May 2009.**

- 2.24 All agreed that some of the UK-EOF resources should, in some form be used to support organisations complying with the requirements of the UK-EOF workstreams. This was thought to be particularly important in those

organisations that do not have existing internal staff working in the area of strategic management of environmental observations. It was also suggested that the need for staff to support the strategic development of environmental observation portfolios should be highlighted as a requirement in the UK-EOF strategic analysis.

- 2.25 Given the difficult economic climate, it was suggested that it was important to plan resources of the UK-EOF further than 2009/10. This point was accepted by the secretariat and had been planned to take place after the strategic analysis was released in November 2009.

### **3. Valuing Environmental Data (Papers E and F)**

#### **Paper E: Data Sharing Vision and proposal**

- 3.1 Following the data Think Tank in September 2008 the UK-EOF were tasked with developing a business case for 'recognising and releasing the value of environmental data' for Bob Watson to take to Permanent Secretaries and Chief Scientific Advisor meetings.
- 3.2 David Lister, who is working under contract to the secretariat to develop the business case, gave a presentation detailing the progress towards developing this vision called the 'Environmental Data Initiative' detailed within the first draft of the Project Initiation Document in Annex E2.
- 3.3 The resource issues, implications for organisational change, governance and need for user cases in the implementation of the EDI were described to the management group. A phased approach would be taken to the development of the EDI. User cases will be developed in April 2009 with the interim catalogue being made available in June 2009. From June organisations would be encouraged to submit metadata in a common INSPIRE compliant format towards the development of a longer-term discovery solution. The full business case would then be completed in October 2009. Throughout this time work would be focussed towards the interface between EDI, SEIS and INSPIRE.
- 3.4 The chair felt that this was a good, ambitious plan and that having the correct governance in place was essential to the success of the programme. As there is such a big agenda this needs to be set-up before the processes are developed. The chair also felt that the plans would benefit from articulating the gaps between EDI and the existing plans for SEIS and INSPIRE and where appropriate, what the justification is for going beyond these and where the costs lay.
- 3.5 It is important that the community understand the interactions between the EDI and other activities such as the UK Location Council and it was suggested that the relationship diagrams in David's talk be made available on the ERFF website.
- 3.6 The PID should explicitly state the benefits to collectors of data as well as users as a lot of, especially smaller organisations, are/will be struggling with the new regulations such as INSPIRE and the EDI will be more likely to succeed if benefits to all involved were built in at the base.
- 3.7 There were concerns at the seemingly centralised approach in phases 2 and 3. This approach may simply complicate what organisations and data warehouses will already be doing to comply to e.g. INSPIRE. It was felt that phase 1 may be sufficient and that phase 1 should focus upon utilising and optimising what already exists in terms of data policies, putting together a discovery catalogue and getting this populated rather than setting up any other new infrastructure.
- 3.8 There was nervousness from some group members that the EDI may not be addressing some of the major problems in accessing and sharing data e.g.

- the government policy of data release from Trading Funds. For example, in relation to the MDIP chart that was suggested for use by the secretariat – although some types of data are strictly speaking, available – access to these may be severely restricted to some, especially smaller organisations due to the high costs charged for their use.
- 3.9 Frances Collingborn informed the group that NERC was in the process of developing an Information Strategy and broadly supported the EDI but would want to see the further details and costings of the exercise before putting any resources into this as it did not want to promise what it could not deliver. NERC also felt that some prioritisation of data for inclusion into the EDI was necessary to avoid 'scope creep'.
  - 3.10 The focus of phase 1 and of the EDI in general was to build from and maximise on existing infrastructure, data policies and best practice with input from the whole community and that these points would be clarified within the next version of the PID. There was unlikely to be any bid for new funding before 2010 but that rather a case would be built for maintaining, joining up and building upon what already exists.
  - 3.11 Bruce Truscott commented the Met Office would like to maintain control of access to its data but be part of a Framework that was working to build on and maintain existing infrastructure. However the Met Office holds international and third party data and therefore needs to be clear what data is in scope of the EDI and whether this is this UK data only. The Met Office also has its own existing national data policy and is involved with many international activities and that anything used by the EDI would have to work alongside these. There was also the issue of data format diversity – the Met Office has its own structure as will many other organisations and that some work would need to be done to standardise and interfacing between these.
  - 3.12 Following on from the discussion of the scope of data within group were asked to consider whether this should be limited to environmental observations data or widened to include all environmental data e.g. that related to modelling and research.
  - 3.13 It was felt by the group that the PID should be taken to the ERFF Main Board in April with more examples what the EDI could be extended to including pros and cons of each option.
  - 3.14 It was felt that the PID should be extended to cover more than one options for infrastructure i.e. that which didn't involve a seemingly centralised resource for discovery e.g. complete open access for data or further development of existing data archive centres. These should have costs and benefits associated with them so that there is a clear indication within the plans where the costs are incurred for each option.
  - 3.15 The group agreed that the secretariat should move forward as planned to develop the business case and data status tables.
  - 3.16 The chair summarised the discussion stating that the management group had given some strong feedback about the structure of the PID and that this should be redrafted to take these into account before Data Solutions Workshop in June 2009. The management requested to view the document again before the June deadline.

**Action 7: Secretariat to proceed in the development of the business case for workstream 2b – the Environmental Data Initiative. Deadline October 2009.**

**Action 8: Secretariat to facilitate the completion of data status tables for each domain for inclusion into the WS2b business case. Deadline 25th September 2009.**

**Action 9: WS2b PID to be redrafted by 15<sup>th</sup> May to take into the MG comments concerning:**

- **Consideration of other options;**
- **Detail of where costs will arise (and to whom);**
- **The benefits to users and collectors.**

**Action 10: Secretariat to make redrafted PID available on Central Desktop by 15th May 2009**

**Action 11: MG to comment on PID and send any comments by 26th June 2009**

- 3.17 The group discussed the representation of ERFF and UK-EOF on the UK Location Council. It was noted that Richard Hughes from BGS has been nominated as the NERC/DIUS representative on the Council. If this was agreed, Beth Greenaway, Michael Schultz and Ian Davidson will meet to explore the possibility of Richard Hughes being asked to report to the ERFF Main Board or whether an additional representative for the environmental science community should be sought.

**Action 12: Defra, NERC and UK-EOF secretariat to discuss the ERFF UK Location Strategy representative. Deadline 20th April 2009**

**Paper F: The interim Environmental Observation Catalogue**

- 3.18 Gemma Truelove gave a presentation focussing upon on the ongoing development of a discovery metadata catalogue within the context of the wider EDI project and upon the development of an interim discovery catalogue by June 2009 as detailed in paper F.
- 3.19 A Data Advisory Group (DAG) had been set up to steer technical aspects of the development of the UK-EOF workstream 2 particularly the development of the longer-term catalogue and data suitability work.
- 3.20 The secretariat were in discussions with James Doughty (Diass Ltd), on behalf of NERC, regarding the development of an interim catalogue through the reuse of the Environmental Data Portal, which had been developed as a research project through the NERC Data Grid.

**Potential Issues with interim catalogue development**

- 3.21 Very little updated information that had been received following the request from December 2008 onwards.
- 3.22 Confidence in the UK-EOF may be reduced if a limited product was delivered. and the management group were asked to decide whether the development of the interim catalogue should be pursued.
- 3.23 The management agreed that a major issue with the release of an interim catalogue would be managing the incompleteness of the information especially as the information would be required for the UK-EOF strategic analysis later in the year.
- 3.24 The group agreed that it was important to develop an interim resource and that the issue of confidence could be mitigated to some degree if all organisations involved in the current information collection could provide updated information in the required timescales.

**Action13: All to ensure that up to date environmental activity information has been sent to the secretariat for inclusion into the interim catalogue by 11th May 2009.**

**Action 14: Secretariat to pursue the interim catalogue (focussing on activity level information) using the Data Advisory Group to approve any technical decisions by 25th June 2009.**

- 3.25 The management group felt that it was important to understand the current status of the contents of the ERFF monitoring database and for the secretariat to highlight the key information required for the 11<sup>th</sup> May deadline and the actions required of them.

**Action 15: Secretariat to send out a brief paper to describe the current status of the ERFF monitoring database contents and to highlight next steps by 3rd April 2009.**

- 3.26 The management group requested a review step for the information contained within the interim catalogue before it was released publicly.

**Action 16: Secretariat and MG (on behalf of organisations) to ensure that the information released in the interim catalogue in June is acceptable by 15th May 2009.**

**Paper G: Assessing Suitability**

- 3.27 A tender for the scoping study had been awarded to Mike Gardner from Atkins Ltd and an interim report had been received on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2008 which the Data Advisory Group would be asked to comment upon. The final report is due on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2009. The outcomes of this phase 1 of the workstream (the scoping study) and the proposal for phase 2 will form a part of the June 25<sup>th</sup> 2009 Data Solutions Workshop (see paper H).
- 3.28 The management group were asked to send any comments on this to Beth Greenaway via email.

**Paper H: Data Solutions Workshop 25<sup>th</sup> June 2009**

- 3.29 Beth Greenaway described the plans for a Data Solutions Workshop on June 25<sup>th</sup> 2009. The workshop aims to communicate to the observation community the UK-EOF's vision in terms of valuing environmental data through the EDI and to focus on key areas and best practice in order to achieve this vision. Since the December 2008 MG meeting the venue has been booked, the event has been advertised and key speakers are in place but further input is required from the MG, particularly with the development of the invitation list. The Management Group were asked to email Beth with comments on the plans and suggestions for the invitation list.

**Action 17: MG to send names for inclusion into the June Data Workshop invitation list by 7th April 2009.**

- 3.30 Peter Costigan mentioned that Bureau Veritas were involved with a European project to look at how the INSPIRE directive would be implemented across the EU and should be included on the invitation list for the event.

**Action 18: BG to contact Bureau Veritas regarding the Data Solutions Workshop by 7th April 2009.**

**4. 'Towards a Statement of Need' (Paper I)**



- 4.1 Andrea Leedale led the discussion on the development of the document 'Towards a Statement of Need' by giving an update on progress made in drafting the document. Anton Edwards was continuing to edit the document which would be released for wider consultation in May 2009.

The SoN Annex tables bring together the current and future observation requirements for the fundamental issues under each domain. The Biosphere and Atmosphere tables had been filled in by Lawrence Way/Keith Porter and John Remedios/Bruce Truscott respectively.

- 4.1.1 Peter Costigan to gave the group an update on the progress with the draft of the document before asking Lawrence, Keith and Bruce to comment upon the pilot completions of the Statement of Need tables.
- 4.1.2 Peter's concerns with the current draft of the SoN were firstly that the continued use of the current estimate of the UK's investment in environmental observations and the uncertainty surrounding that statistic was unhelpful. Secondly he felt that the 'needs' detailed within the document were not user focussed enough i.e. the use of the term observation community could suggest that only observers needs are catered for.
- 4.2 It was agreed that the document was intended to encompass the requirements of both collectors and user of environmental observations data and that the terminology within the document should be consistent, definite and inclusive to avoid alienating any sectors of the community.
- 4.3 It was agreed that Peter Costigan would forward his comments on the document to Andrea Leedale and that both would work together to review the document and make any necessary changes before it was released for consultation.

**Action 19: PC and AL to redraft the document 'Towards a Statement of Need' and to release for consultation by 30th April 2009.**

**SoN tables**

- 4.4 Lawrence Way and Keith Porter then gave their feedback after their pilot completion of the SoN tables for the Biosphere. The first issue in completing the table had been to decide at which level to split the key issues down. A detailed approach was used to allow actions to be highlighted and demonstrated with real evidence. The second column was felt to be a hybrid between discussing the issue and the observation needs and that this should be clarified in any future formatting of the table. It was assumed that the column 'Are current actions sufficient to address this issue' was asking whether the measurements were sufficient to provide the evidence needed to address the issue. Andrea confirmed that this was the case. Overall completing the SoN table had been a useful exercise but some way was needed to link to other domain areas within issues.
- 4.5 Bruce Truscott and John Remedios had discussed the completion of the Atmosphere table and had decided to treat the table as a tool to identify where there are gaps in measurements (as a complement to the UK-EOF catalogue which will describe what is already being undertaken). They identified that they required further input from other members of the atmospheric science community to complete the table. They felt that the existing table would not allow enough detailed information to be collected beyond the broad issues and have altered the existing table to focus in more detail upon the key gaps in measurements and propose to send this out to other atmospheric experts. Bruce asked the group to look at the amended table and comment upon whether the focus on 'data gaps' was correct.

- 4.6 The group discussed the intended focus of the tables. Andrea Leedale commented that the tables had been intended to bring together the issues under each domain and also to show what current measurement capability there was in each area. The group agreed that the table should avoid becoming a 'wish list' for funding and identify current capability in enough detail to highlight the issues without being too time consuming to read or complete. It was agreed that Andrea Leedale would speak to all those involved in the pilot completion of the SoN annex tables to agree the best format for these.

**Action 20: KP, LW, BT, AL and BG to meet to discuss the format of the SoN tables by 24th April 2009.**

**SoN Phase 2 proposal**

- 4.7 The proposed phase 2 of the Statement of Need work will take place between April and November 2009. There are 3 main tasks to complete by July 2009 in order to inform the Strategic Analysis:
- Editing of the document and release for wider consultation;
  - Completion and verification of the annex tables at the SoN workshops;
  - Mapping the requirements to current activities in the environmental observation activity catalogue and highlighting coverage, duplications and strategic gaps
- 4.8 SoN workshops will be held over 3 days in June 2009 with the purpose of discussing and agreeing the content of the annex tables. Each day will host 2 domains, with a joint introductory session, followed by a break out into the relevant domain group to discuss the tables, observation programmes and gaps. Each domain group will be led by 2 co-chairs who will be asked to complete a draft of the domain table before the workshop. The chair will be assisted by a rapporteur who will produce a written report of the meeting.
- 4.9 A table created by Bruce Truscott for the original purpose of assessing the satellite capacity for measuring Essential Climate Variables (ECV's) was discussed as a potential way of starting to map requirements (highlighted through the Statement of Need) to current observational capability.
- 4.9.1 Bruce Truscott commented that the table had taken a lot of input and in depth analysis from experts in the area and therefore could not be replicated in the short timescales required here. Bruce suggested that the workshops could be used to make initial judgements, being careful to show where the uncertainty lay.
- 4.10 The tables were felt to be a powerful way of showing future uncertainty in observations capability but different domains could have different timescales of relevance here, some projecting further into the future than others. The change points may also be different in different domains e.g. at times where programmes end or when user requirements change or in-line with technology developments. It was agreed that the 'traffic light' approach should be used with sensitivity and required further thought before use in the SoN workshops.
- 4.11 The group agreed that the plans for phase 2 of the SoN and that the workshop approach was an important starting point to move this work forward.

**Action 21: Secretariat to facilitate phase 2 of the Statement of Need development as detailed in Paper by 3rd September 2009.**

- 4.12 The success of the workshops would be contingent upon the correct invitation lists being put together. The right balance of domain experts and people in

functional roles will be needed to adequately comment on both domain specific areas including observation systems and issues.

- 4.13 The secretariat will email the current invitation list to the management group and ask members to comment upon this. Management group members were also asked to ensure that they attend at least one meeting which they felt would be appropriate to their expertise.

**Action 22: MG to suggest key experts and rapporteurs for the SoN workshops by 3rd April 2009.**

**Action 23: Each MG member to identify which SoN workshop date they will attend by 3rd April 2009**

- 4.14 There will need to be a clear process for these workshops and adequate briefing materials including the justification for the task for all involved in order that they are successful and provide the UK-EOF with the required information.
- 4.15 A cross-domain view of issues will be important and the secretariat should consider how to make time for this whether within the workshops or at the final wash-up meeting. It will also be important to make time to draw together a final mapping of issues across domains and across all groups.
- 4.16 Approximately 6 days work will be requested from workshop chairs and this may be a significant amount of time for people to commit. The secretariat will consider paying chairs for their time where appropriate and in general it should be ensure that adequate resources for venues, travel and subsistence and administrative support can be found.

**Action 24: Secretariat to ensure that there are sufficient resources to mobilise expertise for the SoN workshops by 24th April 2009.**

## **5. Financial Mechanisms (Papers J and K)**

### **Paper J: Calculating our Investments in Observations WS4a**

- 5.1 Gemma Truelove described the progress towards collecting overall cost information to report to Bob Watson on the 7<sup>th</sup> May 2009. As highlighted during the discussion of paper B, organisations had faced considerable difficulties in mobilising the required resources to provide data to the UK-EOF regarding details and costs of observation activities (for workstreams 2a and 4a).
- 5.2 The group agreed to separate the collection of information about observation activities from the information about costs and the secretariat were asked to make a new secure area on central desktop for organisations to view each other's cost returns. Overall costs will be reported to Bob Watson on the 7<sup>th</sup> May and organisations were asked to make any amendments or new submissions to the secretariat for inclusion into this analysis by 7<sup>th</sup> April 2009.

**Action 25: Secretariat to set up a new area on central desktop for organisations to view each others cost submissions by 31st March 2009.**

**Action 26: All to have submitted and confirmed the total cost of observations according to the UK-EOF definitions to report to Bob Watson by 7<sup>th</sup> April 2009.**

- 5.3 More detailed information regarding costs will be required for the strategic analysis by the end of July 2009. The management group felt that the cost guidance provided so far had been complicated and difficult to understand. It

was agreed that the UK-EOF would highlight the key information required for the strategic analysis and redraft the guidance.

**Action 27: The UK-EOF to highlight the critical cost information and level of aggregation required for the strategic analysis and to resend guidance by 15th May 2009**

- 5.4 It was agreed that information from the second group of organisations proposed to be contacted in phase 2 of the Investment Study was desirable but not essential and that effort should be focussed upon the first 18 organisations involved at this stage.
- 5.5 It was agreed by Cathy Johnston that DECC, new to the UK-EOF management group would attempt to submit information within the required deadlines. The secretariat were asked to forward the relevant documentation to Cathy for completion.

**Action 28: Cost information to be submitted to UK-EOF by 18 organisations for inclusion into strategic analysis by 31<sup>st</sup> July 2009.**

- 5.6 From the discussion of paper B it was clear that some work was needed to support organisations in submitting this information. All agreed that it would be useful if representatives from the secretariat could visit each organisation involved to discuss the new guidelines, providing clarification and assisting in collecting information where appropriate. However, ultimately it is the responsibility of each organisation to submit this information.

**Action 29: All to identify whether they require the UK-EOF to visit their organisation to discuss the cost collection work for the strategic analysis between 15th May and 31st July 2009. Key staff should be identified and dates suggested for meetings by 7th April 2009.**

- 5.7 Staff completing the information returns may not be those who are involved with or aware of the UK-EOF. It was agreed that these staff should be provided with some information that could give describe the aims of the UK-EOF in general and give the specific context of the required cost information.

**Action 30: Secretariat to produce a PowerPoint presentation of the key messages regarding the Investment Study for key staff completing cost returns by 15<sup>th</sup> May 2009.**

- 5.8 Ron Stagg and Tom Leatherland informed the group that there would be a meeting of the Scottish organisations involved in this study to discuss the scope of this study and the returns made so far.
- 5.9 It was clarified that any activities involving domestic animals and plants including disease control were not in the scope of the UK-EOF.

**Paper K: Financial Mechanisms' WS4b – EA, Met Office and SAHFOS case studies**

- 5.10 Progress within workstream 4b was described. This aims to understand the mechanisms in place for financing observations and whether these are fit for purpose. An informal discussion had been held in September 2008 where the secretariat had proposed tendering for a scoping study in this area. However it was agreed at the meeting that it would be more appropriate for this work to be conducted in-house. This work had been delayed due to the other commitments of the secretariat however during this time a study carried out

by SAHFOS had been supported and input had been received from Bruce Truscott at the Met Office. Doug Wilson, the management group champion for this area had intended to give a strawman proposal for moving forward but was unable to attend the meeting.

- 5.11 This work needs to be completed in time to feed into the planned strategic analysis. All agreed to Beth's proposal that the secretariat work with Doug to draft a simple questionnaire to send to management group representatives in order to collect this information.

**Action 31: Doug Wilson and Beth Greenaway to draw up a simple questionnaire regarding organisation's financing mechanisms for circulation to MG members and completed by 31st July 2009**

- 5.12 It was agreed that the questionnaire results should be accompanied by specific examples of issues in providing longer-term funding provided by management group representatives if they were happy to make these public

**Action ? All to provide specific examples of issues concerning organisation's abilities to provide/secure longer-term funding for environmental observations to be released with the questionnaire results by 31<sup>st</sup> July 2009.**

## **6. ERFF and UK-EOF Communications**

- 6.1 Mary Barkham informed the group that Susan Ballard had been appointed as the ERFF Communications Manager. Susan's responsibilities would span all of the projects undertaken within ERFF. Susan has drafted a Communications Strategy for ERFF and will subsequently be focussing upon developing specific communications plans for each ERFF project including the UK-EOF. Susan was keen to move forward workstream 5 and had recognised that there was a big job of communicating internally within sponsoring organisations and a need to understand the internal mechanisms for communication within each stakeholder organisation.
- 6.2 Within each organisation there are internal communications challenges including a high level of competition for interest with other schemes. A UK-EOF Communications plan will help raise the profile of UK-EOF.

**Action 32: All to work with Susan Ballard to produce a UK-EOF communications plan by 8th October 2009.**

**Action 33: Secretariat to issue newsletter no. 2 in April by 30th April 2009.**

**Action 34: MG members to circulate newsletter within their organisations/peer groups by 10 May 2009.**

## **7. Sharing Best Practice**

This discussion was merged with the updates and AOB.

## **8. Updates and AOB**

### **GMES**

- 8.1 Andy Shaw informed the group that there had been a significant development in terms of the GMES services in the last year. The land, marine and emergency response services were being rolled out and the atmosphere and

maritime emergency services were still in development. The UK committed £82 million to the next period of GMES but it was yet to be confirmed where this money will be spent.

- 8.2 The group discussed whether the SoN workshops could feed formally into the GMES UK process. Ian was actioned with pursuing how the SoN will input into the development of GMES services at an EU level (and vice versa).

**Action 35: ID to coordinate the UK-EOF SoN and the GMES processes to ensure that EU level requirements can be incorporated into the SoN by 26th June 2009.**

### **GEOSS**

- 8.3 Andy Shaw introduced GEOSS as a 'system of systems' concept which is part of GEO aiming to join up observing systems to which 80 countries have signed up. GMES is a major EU contribution to this system. A post has now been put in place to coordinate the UK's interest in GEOSS to which the UK-EOF is contributing 5K.
- 8.4 Most recently member states had been asked to look at the proposal for GeoBON and Lawrence Way and Georgina Mace had brought together a UK group to discuss this. The group had had a positive response to this proposal and felt that it was a valuable initiative. JNCC will be leading a follow-on meeting to further discuss UK priorities for GeoBON.
- 8.5 The group agreed that it would be helpful to pursue how the UK-EOF strategic analysis could feed into the GEOSS process.

### **DECC**

- 8.6 Cathy Johnson updated the group on progress within the DECC. The department had been formed from the previous BERR Energy and Defra Climate Change groups. The scope of the departments work includes the Hadley Centre, inputs to overseas work and response strategies. The department is currently in a phase of business planning and is conscious of the importance of observation systems although the department does not directly fund many of these.

### **GECC Review**

- 8.7 DECC have also become the owners of GECC and Cathy Johnson confirmed that a draft report had been sent to GECC subgroups for comment. The UK-EOF should consider how to interact with the outcomes of this report as the global understanding of the UK's reliance on global systems is within the scope of the framework. It was noted however that the group would need more resources in order to take this work on.

### **NERC Themes and Action Plans**

- 8.8 In the NERC Theme Action Plans there are 3 specific actions on the UK-EOF, 1 of which is within the biodiversity theme. The secretariat are holding a preliminary meeting with Pamela Kempton (NERC) and Lawrence Way at the end of April (JNCC) to discuss this.

### **NERC National Capability**

- 8.9 Frances Collingborn informed the group that the first National Capability Action Plan will be released at the end of this year.
- 8.10 The RCUK large facilities roadmap would be released in early 2010 and input is required by October/November this year. Anything that is suggested for inclusion needs to have an outline business case associated with it. Suggestions should be forwarded to NERC who will liaise with RCUK.

- 8.11 The group discussed how the UK-EOF strategic analysis could feed into the NERC NCAG decisions making process. Peter Costigan who is a representative on the NERC National Capability Advisory Group (NCAG) was unsure of how these timescales could fit together and would pursue these issues on behalf of UK-EOF with Michael Schultz.

**Action 36: NERC and Peter Costigan to discuss the coordination of the NERC NCAG actions plan and the UK-EOF Strategic Analysis and Statement of Need by 26th June 2009.**

- 8.12 NCAG Horizon Scanning is taking place in July 2009 and it was not clear whether the UK-EOF would be sufficiently advanced in terms of the strategic analysis in order to feed into this. Liz Fellman from NERC is running this workshop and Mary Barkham will discuss with her how and whether the UK-EOF SoN workshop material can be useful to the NCAG Horizon Scanning meeting.

**Action 37: MB to discuss with Liz Fellman (NERC) whether the UK-EOF SoN workshop material will be useful for the NCAG Horizon Scanning workshop by 26th June 2009.**

#### **QUEST**

- 8.13 Andrea Leedale had attended a recent QUEST meeting which aimed to look at the key requirements for understanding atmospheric carbon in the next ten years. A considerable amount of the discussion had concerned long-term monitoring and observational needs and how these feed into research programmes. The QUEST programme is due to end in June 2010 and will produce a report of all its associated findings.

#### **National Ecosystem Assessment**

- 8.14 Peter Costigan informed the group that this was close to being launched. The NAE would be a UK wide assessment which had been agreed with the devolved administrations. It will operate with an 'intelligent secretariat' and an 'expert panel'. It will operate over 2 years and will produce a report 'Status and Trends of Ecosystems' in the first year. In the second year the potential responses to different scenarios will be investigated.
- 8.15 Beth highlighted the interlinkages with Workstream 3 and the reliance of the study on the UK-EOF

#### **INSPIRE**

- 8.16 There is a formal Defra consultation concerning how the INSPIRE directive is transposed as UK law and the group considered whether to respond to this within the UK-EOF or separately. Some members had already been consulted on but it was agreed that the secretariat should read the consultation document and flag up to the group any UK-EOF wide issues.

**Action 38: Secretariat to read the INSPIRE consultation documentation and inform the MG where there are significant issues for their organisations by 15<sup>th</sup> May 2009.**

### **9. Date and Format of the Next Meeting**

- 9.1 The dates of the next meeting had already been agreed as part of the SoN discussions in relation to Paper I. The group would meet again on September 3<sup>rd</sup> and October 8<sup>th</sup> 2009 to discuss the strategic analysis and decision making framework. The preferred meeting locations were Swindon or Reading.

**Action 39: Secretariat to search for meeting locations and send proposals to management group by 31<sup>st</sup> May 2009.**

9.2 Lawrence Way closed the meeting, thanking all present for their input, particularly as many difficult issues had been discussed and reiterated that there were several actions on member organisations to move forward the work of the UK-EOF in the next 6 months.

**Meeting closed at 15:45**

**10. Action List**

No.	Action	Whom	Deadline
<b>Paper B</b>			
1	UK-EOF secretariat to proceed with plans for the strategic analysis to be delivered.	Sec.	Nov 2009
2	Secretariat to update the Delivery Plan with the new milestone chart.	Sec.	7 <sup>th</sup> April 2009
3	MG members to ensure that they cascade the guidance to the correct people and ensure that the deadlines are met.	All	
<b>Paper D</b>			
4	Invoices to be raised in the next Financial Year	Sec.	May 1 <sup>st</sup> 2009
5	All management group organisations to have submitted a co-funding letter confirming their contributions to the UK-EOF for 2009/10.	All	3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2009
6	Beth Greenaway to meet with Ian Davidson to discuss resource allocation in relation to ways of embedding/ resourcing UK-EOF work within member organisations.	BG, ID	31 <sup>st</sup> May 2009
<b>Paper E</b>			
7	Secretariat to proceed in the development of the business case for workstream 2b – the Environmental Data Initiative.	Sec.	October 2009
8	Secretariat to facilitate the completion of data status tables for each domain for inclusion into the WS2b business case.	Sec.	25 <sup>th</sup> August 2009
9	WS2b PID to be redrafted to take into the MG comments concerning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of other options;</li> <li>• Detail of where costs will arise (and to whom);</li> <li>• The benefits to users.</li> </ul>	Sec.	12 <sup>th</sup> May 2009
10	Secretariat to make redrafted PID available on Central Desktop.	Sec.	15 <sup>th</sup> May 2009
11	MG to comment on PID and send any comments prior to the public announcement at the June workshop.	All	29 <sup>th</sup> May 2009
12	Defra, NERC and UK-EOF secretariat to discuss the ERFF UK Location Strategy representative.	PC, MS and BG	20 <sup>th</sup> April 2009
<b>Paper F</b>			
13	All to ensure that up to date environmental activity information has been sent to the secretariat for	All	11 <sup>th</sup> May 2009



	inclusion into the interim catalogue.		
14	Secretariat to pursue the interim catalogue (focussing on activity level information) using the Data Advisory Group to approve any technical decisions.	Sec.	25 <sup>th</sup> June 2009
15	Secretariat to send out a brief paper to describe the current status of the ERFF monitoring database contents and to highlight next steps.	Sec.	3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2009
16	Secretariat and MG (on behalf of organisations) to ensure that the information released in the interim catalogue in June is acceptable.	All	12 <sup>th</sup> May 2009
<b>Paper H</b>			
17	MG to send names for inclusion into the June Data Workshop invitation list.	All	7 <sup>th</sup> April 2009
18	BG to contact Bureau Veritas regarding the Data Solutions Workshop.	BG	7 <sup>th</sup> April 2009
<b>Paper I</b>			
19	PC and AL to redraft the document 'Towards a Statement of Need' and to release for consultation.	AL, PC	30 <sup>th</sup> April 2009
20	Meeting to discuss the format of the SoN tables.	KP, LW, BT, AL and BG	24 <sup>th</sup> April 2009
21	Secretariat to facilitate phase 2 of the Statement of Need development as detailed in Paper I.	Sec.	3 <sup>rd</sup> September 2009
22	MG to suggest key experts and rapporteurs for the SoN workshops.	All	3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2009
23	Each MG member to identify which SoN workshop date they will attend.	All	3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2009
24	Secretariat to ensure that there are sufficient resources to mobilise expertise for the SoN workshops.	Sec.	24 <sup>th</sup> April 2009
<b>Paper J</b>			
25	Secretariat to set up a new area on central desktop for organisations to view each others cost submissions.	Sec.	31 <sup>st</sup> March 2009
26	All to have submitted and confirmed the total cost of observations according to the UK-EOF definitions to report to Bob Watson on 7 <sup>th</sup> May 2009.	All	7 <sup>th</sup> April 2009
27	The UK-EOF to highlight the critical cost information and level of aggregation required for the strategic analysis and to resend guidance.	Sec.	15 <sup>th</sup> May 2009
28	Cost information to be submitted to UK-EOF by 18 organisations for inclusion into strategic analysis	All	31 <sup>st</sup> July 2009.
29	All to identify whether they require the UK-EOF to visit their organisation to discuss the cost collection work for the strategic analysis between 15 <sup>th</sup> May and 31 <sup>st</sup> July 2009. Key staff should be identified and dates suggested for meetings.	All	7 <sup>th</sup> April 2009
30	Secretariat to produce a PowerPoint presentation of the key messages regarding the Investment Study for key staff completing cost returns.	Sec.	15 <sup>th</sup> May 2009
<b>Paper K</b>			

31	Doug Wilson and Beth Greenaway to draw up a simple questionnaire regarding organisation's financing mechanisms for circulation to MG members.	Sec.	31 <sup>st</sup> July 2009
<b>Communications and AOB</b>			
32	To work with Susan Ballard to produce a UK-EOF communications plan.	Sec.	8 <sup>th</sup> October 2009
33	To issue newsletter no. 2 in April	Sec	30 <sup>th</sup> April 2009
34	MG members to circulate newsletter within their organisations/peer groups.	Sec	10 <sup>th</sup> May 2009
35	ID to coordinate the UK-EOF SoN and the GMES processes to ensure that EU level requirements can be incorporated into the SoN.	ID	26 <sup>th</sup> June 2009
36	NERC and Peter Costigan to discuss the coordination of the NERC NCAG actions plan and the UK-EOF Strategic Analysis and Statement of Need.	PC, MS	26 <sup>th</sup> June 2009
37	MB to discuss with Liz Fellman (NERC) whether the UK-EOF SoN workshop material will be useful for the NCAG Horizon Scanning workshop.	MB	26 <sup>th</sup> June 2009
38	Secretariat to read the INSPIRE consultation documentation and inform the MG where there are significant issues for their organisations.	BG	15 <sup>th</sup> May 2009
<b>Date and format of next meetings</b>			
39	Secretariat to trawl for locations for the next MG meetings on 3 <sup>rd</sup> September and 8 <sup>th</sup> October.	Sec.	31 <sup>st</sup> May 2009