

CGI Council Meeting 5**Notes and Actions****Date:** 24 May 2007**Time:** 9.30 – 16:45**Location:** University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina, USA

Attendees:

Dave Soller	USGS Secretary
Ian Jackson	BGS (IJ) Chair
Koji Wakita	JGS (KW)
John Broome	ESS/GSC (JB)
François Robida	BRGM (FR)
Simon Cox	CSIRO (SCx)

Apologies:

Kristine Asch	BGR (KA)
Gabriel Asato	SEGEMAR (GA)
Sergei Chersakov	SGM RAS (SC)
Max Fernandez	KMMA (MF)
Anna-Karren Nguno	GSN (AN)

1. Welcome and confirmation of agenda and timetable

The agenda was accepted.

2. Minutes of last meeting (Liege 2006)

The notes of the last meeting were accepted as accurate.

3. Actions from previous meetings

Action numbers below relate to the Liege notes. Actions not included below were discharged previously (see summary list sent out by IJ)

4/3 – ideas for CGI expenditure – scant response from Council members. Item remains active.

4/4 – adding and updating website content. It hasn't happened. We will assign ownership of website sections/pages to individual Council members.

5/1	Delegate web sections/pages to Council members.	IJ
------------	---	-----------

4/13 – discharged (to be discussed under agenda item 6.1)

4/14	Each Regional WG must at a minimum produce a document containing: a list of countries within the RWG; a list of contact details (email etc); a list of relevant information standards in each country; and a list of the major issues	SC, KW	Still required
-------------	---	---------------	-----------------------

4/16 – SCx was unable to attend; KW attended conference

4/19 – Support for Outreach Workshop – little/no positive response. Action deleted. (To be discussed under agenda item 7)

4/21 – MF asked R Missotten about this – UNESCO is supportive in principle, but not able to assist financially. Item is discharged.

4/22 – This relates to preparing a basic Cookbook for IM and information delivery. The task is ambitious, and hasn't been done. Decision was to address this within more specialized topics (e.g., GeoSciML), but to delete this action.

4/24	Translate the more important CGI web pages into their local language. (K Bull will inform all of the most visited pages)	AN, KA, SC, FR, KW,	Still required
-------------	--	--------------------------------	-----------------------

4. Treasurer's Report

~USD30K in the bank. Most of this has been earmarked for the Namibian workshop. Discussion on how much is appropriate to this objective.

Discussion of high cost of shipping the CGI brochures to Belgium. Lesson learned – always estimate total cost before allocating work.

5/2	Provide KW with the electronic file of the pamphlet, so he can translate it into Japanese and distribute it.	AN, KW
------------	--	---------------

5. Working Groups

5.1 Data Model/GeoSciML

A separate ad hoc meeting of members of the Council and the GeoSciML team had taken place on 23 May to discuss issues emerging from the growing interest in GeoSciML (eg collaboration, endorsement and support). Notes from this meeting will be released separately.

KW provided comment from the Japanese perspective on the Interoperability Working Group and the Tuscon meeting.

SCx provided some clarification on roles of OGC vs. CGI: OGC & ISO/TC 211 defines standards/specifications for cross-domain geospatial applications (e.g. WMS, WFS, and registry technologies). Specialized standards covering domain-specific aspects (e.g., geology) are the concern of domain-specific organizations, like CGI. OGC provides a general toolkit, so that domains can develop data-exchange standards that are synchronised as much as possible with other disciplines, allowing some inter-domain information exchange, and enabling some software re-use and thus economies of scale. Certification of GeoSciML – since it is a domain specific technology, it is outside the scope of OGC, and probably of ISO/TC 211. After GeoSciML is published by CGI, we might investigate whether an ISO Technical Committee would be suitable for formal standardization, though TC 211 appears to be the only current committee with a relevant scope.

5/3	For Council's use, succinctly describe a possible GeoSciML certification and publication procedure and the roles of CGI, OGC, ISO, etc.	SCx. FR
------------	---	----------------

5.2 MLT

A full discussion of the current unsatisfactory situation took place. Given complexities and sensitivities a separate document summarizing discussion and options will be developed.

5/4	Document MLT discussion and options	DS
------------	-------------------------------------	-----------

6. Regional Working Groups:

6.1 SE Asia – KW

GeoGrid project this year will provide budget for GeoSciML technology to the WG (see KW report submitted before meeting). Council wished to know more about members of this and other RWGs.

5/5	Produce spreadsheet containing, for each WG member, their country, organization, email and website address (see also Action 4/14 above)	KW, SC, GA
------------	---	-------------------

6.2 Russia – SC

SC's written report raised a number of questions and issues about membership and responsibilities of CGI and its Council. These to be put direct to SC.

5/6	Draft letter from CGI Council to SC and clarify expectations of CGI and Council members	JB
------------	---	-----------

6.3 South America – GA

Council had received an exemplary report of progress. Principal activities include promotion of OneGeology, annex with list of contacts made in 2007. Five RWG members met while in Brighton. He requests that we post Spanish translation of CGI website.

5/7	Send GA and KW note of thanks for regional coordination efforts	JB
------------	---	-----------

It was agreed that outreach activities in South America may yield significant short-term benefits.

5/8	Consider proposal for outreach activity in South America	All Council
------------	--	--------------------

7. Outreach workshop:

Report from KA discussed. Status of workshop with Namibia has not changed significantly from last meeting. A 130K Euro German Govt aid proposal to fund the workshop will be submitted. If this fails our fallback position would be to use CGI funds, which are not sufficient to meet the original plan. Question raised as to whether in this case it be coordinated with another initiative/workshop/conference, to leverage funds – eg AEGOS? It was noted that IUGS expect this CGI Workshop to take place.

It was agreed we need to discuss with as many of Council as possible as soon as possible. There will be a teleconference in June to discuss how to progress this workshop. Topics of the telecom will include: 1) expected outcomes of this workshop; 2) the option of coordinating the workshop date with the AEGOS meeting; 3) what should the local organizing committee be responsible for – clearly articulate what is expected of them, and ask if they can meet our expectations; 4) what can each Council member contribute (if anything); 5) discuss “end-member” workshop options (original plan versus reduced-scope meeting with minimal funding); 6) timelines.

5/9	Arrange time, date and logistics for teleconference on Outreach workshop	JB
------------	--	-----------

8. IGC2008:

CGI Council meeting and a public forum will be held at the IGC. This needs organising as it will be an “old” and “new” Council. Timing may pose a problem for SCx and FR as all business meetings are on same day as all Workshops.

The proposed symposium on geoscience information (sponsored by CGI, IAMG and GIC) has been accepted by the IGC2008 organisers, but the sub-sessions were not publicised in the 2nd Circular.

5/10	Clarify specifics of Information symposium with IGC organisers and advise CGI, including website posting	IJ
-------------	--	-----------

Other Geoscience Information-related sessions have been submitted. In particular a Symposium on international geological maps includes a session on OneGeology and map standards.

5/11	Discuss coordination of symposia with KA	JB
5/12	Create 2 banners for CGI sessions at IGC	IJ

9. Election process for CGI Council:

The election process was discussed, and Council was unanimous that we need to get a clear and transparent procedure agreed early to avoid confusion. We also agreed that: a) all current Council can stand for re-election if they so wish (ie no-one has served 2 full terms); b) a new Council must be elected by the membership; d) the wider community needs to be made aware that they need to be a member of CGI if they wish to vote; e) that the new Council will elect the Chair, Secretary General and Treasurer and then ask for these to be endorsed by the IUGS Executive. It was agreed that detailed procedures need to be produced and promulgated soon.

5/13	Summarise issues and draft detailed Council election procedures and copy to Council for comment	JB
-------------	---	-----------

5/14	Publicize need to join CGI if wish to vote on or be a member of Council	All Council
-------------	---	--------------------

The request from the Australian Chief Geologists via GGIPAC to nominate a new member of CGI Council was discussed. The Council of CGI is in the first instance ab personam, not representative of an organisation, nation or region, however, a good geographic balance is desired. Given this and the nearing elections in 2008, a new Australian nominee should apply at that time.

5/15	Draft response to GGIPAC on request for additional Australian member	IJ
-------------	--	-----------

10. OneGeology initiative:

The question of the relationship between CGI and OneGeology had been posed. Council agreed that CGI supports the technology that enables the OneGeology content – ie GeoSciML. In turn, OneGeology provides an effective means for CGI's GeoSciML development, take up and role out. CGI/GeoSciML and OneGeology are symbiotic. Thus the conclusion of the discussion was that CGI is supportive of OneGeology and that they are partners.

11. GIS in Geology Conference in Mexico:

For information, no action required.

12. CoData meeting:

JB reported on what was predominantly an academic conference. Council agreed JB should continue as the IUGS delegate.

13. IUGS links and expectations:

We are very highly regarded. Therefore, expectations are high. There was concern by some that the activity for which funding has been provided (Africa outreach workshop) is essentially unrelated to one of the the primary reasons for the high regard (i.e. the GeoSciML initiative).

14. Geoinformatics Summit:

There is a move to try and coordinate the various international initiatives in geoinformation and hold a "summit". This is being coordinated by Charles Barton. The proposed date is March 2008. All members of Council who receive information about this should ensure they keep others informed.

15. Connection with GEOSS initiative:

BRGM has been approached to participate in a pilot, which could be designed to utilize GeoSciML.

5/16	Provide background information on GEOSS, and keep Council informed.	FR
-------------	---	-----------

16. Any other business:

16.1 Communication between CGI and Interoperability Working Group

Decision - FR will be the point of contact.

16.2 GIC meeting

CGI and GIC sensitivities. IJ, JB and FR will discuss and work to allay concerns

16.3 Membership and attendance at Council meetings

Disappointment in attendance and responsiveness was expressed. Unanimity that this must improve and simple protocols complied with (i.e. as stated in the by-laws, it is a duty of Council members to attend annual Council meetings).

16.4 Website:

CGI website appears outdated and this is a direct reflection of the lack of contribution of the Council.

5/16	Review and report on the website and an improved architecture (see also Action 5/1)	SCx
-------------	---	------------

16.5 Council communication

Overall our record is not good. Too often there is a lack of response to requests. Silence has been taken as assent. All requests should carry deadlines; after that deadline, the concluding email to Council will in future include a list of named people who responded and names who did not.

Council will consider using teleconferences to conduct some business. We will evaluate effectiveness of the June teleconference on the Outreach Workshop, and if successful plan to have them more frequently.

16.6 Spending the budget

We have a budget surplus However, most of it is expected to be dedicated to the planned Namibian workshop.

17. Date and place of next meeting:

The meeting at the IGC was agreed. IT needs to be planned as a transition meeting, from old to new Council.

An additional meeting of this Council would be desirable to plan for this; ie to plan for transition to new Council, (perhaps in April or May, 2008). Full attendance of Council is not expected

5/17	Arrange Council meeting at IGC and also an intermediate meeting to plan for this	IJ
-------------	--	-----------

Ian Jackson
1 June 2007