

Steering Group meeting and open discussion on the future governance of OneGeology

Summary Minutes

Location: 33rd IGC, Lilleström, Norway

Time: 1400

Date: 12 August 2008

Attendees:

Manuel Pubellier	Centre for Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) + Commission for the Geological Map of the World (CGMW)	
Peter Bobrowsky	International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS)	
Jean-Paul Cadet	Commission for the Geological Map of the World (CGMW)	
Philippe Rossi	Commission for the Geological Map of the World (CGMW)	
Robert Missotten	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)	
Marivic Uzarraga	Co-ordinating Committee for Geoscience Programmes in East and Southeast Asia (CCOP)	
Patrice Christmann	EuroGeoSurveys	
John Broome	Earth Science Sector Canada	Canada
Marc D'lorio	Earth Science Sector Canada	Canada
Paula Cornejo	Servicio Nacional de Geología y Minería	Chile
Jian Shien	Geological Survey of China	China
Liu Fengshan	Geological Survey of China	China
Zdeneck Venera	Czech Geological Survey	Czech Republic
Robert Tomas	Czech Geological Survey	Czech Republic
Johnny Frederic	Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland (GEUS)	Denmark
François Robida	Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et Minières (BRGM)	France
Cathy Truffert	Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et Minières (BRGM)	France
Kristine Asch	Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources (BGR)	Germany
Hans-J Kümpel	Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources (BGR)	Germany
Peadar McArdle	Geological Survey of Ireland	Ireland
Luca Demicheli	Italian High Institute for Environmental Protection and Research	Italy
Eikichi Tsukuda	Geological Survey of Japan	Japan
Namsrajau Enkhchimeg	Mineral Resources and Petroleum Authority of Mongolia (MRPAM)	Mongolia
Dorjsuren Jaukhlaubold	Mineral Resources and Petroleum Authority of Mongolia (MRPAM)	Mongolia
Gabi Schneider	Geological Survey of Namibia	Namibia
Alex Malahoff	GNS Science	New Zealand
Oysten Nordgulen	Geological Survey of Norway	Norway
Luis Martins	Geological Department of Portugal (INETI)	Portugal
Stefan Marincea	Geological Institute of Romania	Romania

Grigory Brekov	A P Karpinsky Russian Geological Research Institute (VSEGEI)	Russia
Stefan Kacer	Slovak Geological Survey	Slovakia
Marko Komac	Geological Survey of Slovenia	Slovenia
Frik Hartzler	Council for Geoscience	South Africa
José-Pedro Calvo	Instituto Geológico y Minero de España (IGME)	Spain
Carlos Schobbenhaus	Serviço Geológico do Brasil (CPRM)	Brazil
Cecilio Quesada	Instituto Geológico y Minero de España (IGME)	Spain
Peter Hayoz	Swiss Geological Survey	Switzerland
John Ludden	British Geological Survey	UK
Ian Jackson	British Geological Survey	UK
Katy Booth	British Geological Survey	UK
Harvey Thorleifson	Association of American State Geologists	USA
Suzette Kimball	United States Geological Survey	USA
Peter Lyttle	United States Geological Survey	USA

Bold = pro tem Steering Group member

Proposed Agenda:

1. *Introductions*
2. *Brief update on status and progress – the scientific operational and technical aspects of OneGeology*
3. *Discussion on options for the future governance model*

Followed by informal extended post-meeting discussion of some issues (see Annex)

1. Introductions

Brief introduction of all attendees.

Ian Jackson explained that because of the success of OneGeology and discussions between directors before and during the IGC the original Steering Group meeting had been broadened in scope and attendance.

2. Update on status and progress

An overview and summary of progress to date and the current status of the OneGeology initiative was provided.

The discussion that followed loosely followed the agenda and concentrated on the major, overarching issues, in particular those that were perceived to need addressing imminently in order to allow successful continuation of OneGeology.

3. Discussion on options for the future governance model

- 3.1 The pro-tem Steering Group and the directors present at the meeting unanimously and formally endorsed the continuation and development of OneGeology.
- 3.2 It was offered by BGS and BRGM, and agreed by the meeting, that these two organisations should continue their operational and technical co-ordination roles for the time being. Both confirmed they would commit to continue current funding/resources levels for a further 18 months to allow the necessary operational, governance and technical decisions to be taken by the OneGeology community and steering group.
- 3.3 A representative from the Middle East was unable to attend the Steering Group but had fully endorsed the project and is committed to the continuation of OneGeology.
- 3.4 An outline of current costs was provided. Approximately 300 000 Euros each are currently provided by BGS and BRGM annually. This includes staff time and hard/software, as well as communication and exhibition materials. The technical lead has come from several surveys

including Japan, France, Australia, US, UK, Canada and Sweden. BRGM have invested substantially in order to provide the Portal – including technical expertise to develop the registry as well as software/computer infrastructure. OneGeology is formally identified as an individual project within both the BRGM and BGS corporate programmes. Breakdowns of the funding currently provided by BGS and BRGM were requested. These will be made available.

ACTION: I Jackson, F Robida

- 3.5 H J Kumpel of BGR stated that they are willing to engage more fully and will contribute where possible. Many surveys represented also offered to support the initiative through “in-kind” support ie staff time. The USGS confirmed that it will include OneGeology work as part of their geological mapping programme. P Lyttle also confirmed that USGS fully endorse the vision of OneGeology and are proud to be a part of it.
- 3.6 It was recognised that in addition to this in-kind support, those who make up the Technical Working and Operational Management groups are providing significant extra input and resource.
- 3.7 The meeting considered the following questions:
- How should we organise OneGeology operationally?
 - How do you see the governance model?
- 3.8 The discussion followed these elements:
- Governance and principles on data
 - Operational element currently coordinated/led by BGS and BRGM.
- 3.9 It was noted there was a need for more formal agreements on provision of in-kind resources and also need to document how we should move forward with the project and also, some felt, with scientific harmonisation (all should have the opportunity to contribute to this).
- 3.10 The Steering Group: the pro tem group did not meet prior to the IGC and there were and are problems in getting representation from some parts of the world. Steering Group representation going forward was then discussed.
- 3.11 It was agreed that there was a need to have one representative per global region, but that first there was a need to establish the definition of these regions. (CGMW also noted it has one representative for each part of the world and confirmed that this is a very efficient model).
- 3.12 It was agreed as the majority “ownership” of OneGeology is within the Geological Surveys; Steering Group representatives should be from a national survey in each of the world’s regions. Other contributing organisations such as CGMW, IYPE, IUGS, UNESCO, ISCGM are key associates in the OneGeology initiative.
- 3.13 It was agreed that representatives should be nominated within these global regions (and noted that this is how it would probably work in Africa). The President of EuroGeoSurveys would be the European Steering Group representative, but in the event of a conflict of interest (eg when BGS/BRGM are Presidents) the Vice President would take up the role.

ACTION: I Jackson - provide options for defining regions of the globe to Directors of Surveys and pro tem Steering Group (and attendees of meeting).

ACTION: Directors of Surveys and pro tem Steering Group - agree best option for defining regions of globe.

ACTION: Directors of Surveys - following agreement on definition of global regions each group of surveys within a region nominate a representative to be a member of the new Steering Group for each of these and send this nomination to I Jackson.

- 3.14 The role of, and issues to be considered by, the new Steering Group were discussed. They included the following:

Should we seek/accept funding/sponsorship e.g. from the commercial sector? How should we respond to offers? What should OneGeology's relationship with GoogleEarth be? Conditions of any sponsorship will be very important and some said they would support this method of funding if the conditions were suitable. Others were less enthusiastic about sponsorship, given they were fully government funded. Intellectual Property Rights and policies on data release were touched on.

ACTION: I Jackson - to organise a Steering Group meeting as soon as possible.

- 3.15 Johnny Frederic of GEUS noted that the Steering Group discussions might include: Developing a body to help others; A roadmap of the vision of OneGeology – what we should put in to OneGeology; Should we take all other kinds of geological data.
- 3.16 During the IGC a number of people had asked whether OneGeology data could be purchased and a number of offers of sponsorship had been made. These points need to be considered in detail by the future Steering Group and policy established.
- 3.17 Peter Lyttle, USGS, considered that specific discussions regarding the private sector may be premature because the current content and situation of OneGeology is not yet suitably mature. However, he agreed the principles need to be explored and set out. Patrice Christmann, EGS, advised that any sponsorship should be transparent and open in line with OGC compliance. Marivic Uzarraga, CCOP, felt that OneGeology detailed discussions of the sponsorship issue was essential prior to establishing policy.
- 3.18 The issue of scale was briefly discussed. Scale of the data differs from country to country and is the decision of each individual survey which selects what data they wish to serve. It was agreed that the issue of scale was one which should be discussed further within the Steering Group.
- 3.19 For all the issues above position/options papers from the Operational Management Group would be needed.

ACTION: Operational Management Group

- 3.20 The meeting then moved on to perspectives from OneGeology's different stakeholders. Robert Missotten, UNESCO, confirmed his organisation is very supportive of OneGeology and stressed the importance of the linkage of OneGeology to GEOSS. Much work had been done on the data sharing/handling principles and he recommended OneGeology should utilise this framework and liaise with GEOSS. This was endorsed by Patrice Christmann. Ian Jackson noted that he had already been approached to send a OneGeology representative to an EC GEO meeting. UNESCO offered to help to facilitate linkages with other relevant international initiatives to ensure complementary development. The Global Co-ordinating Committee is very important (CGMW, UNESCO, IUGS, IGMW, ICOGS) to ensure overarching co-ordination and that all are working together.
- 3.21 Jean-Paul Cadet of CGMW confirmed that OneGeology and CGMW are complementary and that CGMW fully support OneGeology. CGMW will provide the 1:25M scale geological map of the World and their other maps.
- 3.22 Peter Bobrowsky confirmed that IUGS fully endorses and promotes OneGeology. IUGS will ensure it is successful and will continue to support at a high level, including being available on an advisory body if necessary.
- 3.23 Patrice Christmann, EGS, considered it important to co-ordinate with Spatial Data Infrastructure Initiatives e.g. INSPIRE so as to encourage exchange of knowledge and information.
- 3.24 John Broome, ESS, confirmed the need to consider IPR issues and noted that a provisional discussion paper had already been prepared for the pro tem Steering Group by the Operational Management Group.

- 3.25 Robert Tomas, CGS, reinforced that there is a continuing need to improve the participation and recruitment of new countries and encourage involvement.
- 3.26 Members of the Global Co-ordinating Committee present re-iterated their support of OneGeology.
- 3.27 It was restated by those at the meeting that Directors of Geological Surveys and the pro tem Steering Group will decide how the initiative will move forward and they will review/refresh the Steering Group in order to do that. The re-constituted Steering Group will consider and propose a flexible working model and put forward this proposed model to the Directors of Geological Surveys. In the interim period BGS and BRGM will continue to co-ordinate and support the OneGeology operation and portal.
- 3.28 It was agreed that the Operational Management Group (currently made up of volunteers) will continue and the Steering Group will make proposals for the operational structure and their future role and decide on whether an "elected" body is necessary.
- 3.29 It was agreed that consideration of possible governance structure options be delegated to the Steering Group who will come forward with proposals to Directors.
- 3.30 Alex Malahoff, GNS, provided examples of the New Zealand Survey's funding policy and the positive role of sponsorship. He noted that GNS have a corporate lawyer to advise on such issues and indicated that this expertise was extremely useful and could be made available.
- 3.31 It was agreed that the Steering Group should have a temporary chair/lead and that this was a first task of the new Steering Group. It was proposed and agreed that Ian Jackson be the Executive Secretary of the Steering Group for the time being. I Jackson accepted this post.
- 3.32 Paula Cornejo highlighted her concerns regarding the serving of data for other countries. It was agreed that this issue needed more detailed discussion within the Operational Management Group/Steering Group. Paula should provide a summary of her views which could be considered.
- 3.33 Ian Jackson closed the formal element of the meeting and thanked all present and the OneGeology teams in the individual surveys, especially BRGM, BGS and all those who have been intensively involved so far for their teamwork and support. Several attendees then remained for an informal and more detailed discussion of a number of issues raised. Notes of this are in the attached Annex.

Annex: Notes of informal extended post-meeting discussion of issues

Views were exchanged on several topics:

The need for a governance model

- a. Zdeneck Venera, CGS, noted the options that had been set out in the OneGeology position paper and raised the issue of governance and what model was appropriate. Although some felt an urgent need to decide a model for governance for OneGeology and it was agreed to be important, the majority felt decisions such as this cannot be rushed and much detailed and reasoned discussions must take place first.
- b. Ian Jackson was asked his opinion on the optimum model for OneGeology. He replied that the status of “incorporated legal entity” such as that of EuroGeoSurveys, or CGMW, or IYPE, would seem to be the preferred option but this needs further full and detailed discussion. A full commercial entity would dissuade many geological surveys and OneGeology is not at a stage where this could even be considered yet.
- c. Cecilio Quesada, IGME, noted that at the Brighton meeting, it was agreed that such decisions would be in place by the next IGC in 2012, therefore there is no rush and plenty of time for full discussion, which should take place at the level of Survey Directors.
- d. Gabi Schneider, GSN, said that endorsements from each region are needed and these decisions cannot be taken at this stage.

Funding and financial aspects

- e. It was agreed that funding would be extremely useful in order to accelerate development of OneGeology. The resources available currently are mainly in-kind support. In order to receive funding would require OneGeology to have some form of legal entity. It would also be easier to provide funding and assistance into developing nations.
- f. It was suggested that a policy of “matching funds” could be adopted e.g. to raise certain amounts from industry, Shell, BP, governments etc. It was also noted that some surveys may require help to develop and serve their map data and that this would require resources.
- g. It was agreed that accepting sponsorship for a specific event, such as the Brighton meeting, would be perfectly acceptable.
- h. OneGeology data is freely available for non-commercial use only. If commercial usage of data is requested, this must be referred to the holder/owner of that data, ie the relevant Survey or Organisation.
- i. Some organisations are currently not able to provide their data online for free e.g. Russia and some African countries. Several surveys must charge for data and this is an important source of income to them.

Sustaining OneGeology

- j. John Broome, ESS, noted that sustaining OneGeology will be a major challenge and will continue to need a number of elements including:-
 - a shop window;
 - additional detail;
 - an ability to show different types of geoscience data;
 - and to allow and encourage an exchange of knowledge.

He agreed to document these thoughts into a paper for the Steering Group.

ACTION: John Broome

- k. Cecilio Quesada felt that any discussion on sustainability needs to recognise the successful way activities to date had been carried out and that the future progress relies on the groups that have been actively driving the initiative forward. These should remain in place.
- l Robert Tomas, CGS, proposed a document to clearly identify the main goals and success criteria for the next four years. This would be helpful for the Steering Group. Suggested examples include:-
- double the number of countries participating;
 - have more than 75% of these countries serving data;
 - create better resolution;
 - have a functioning governance model in place that everyone is comfortable with;
 - have good publicity;
 - maintain progress in harmonisation across continents;
 - formalise OneGeology as a legal entity.

A document such as this should be drafted by the Operational Management Group

ACTION: Robert Tomas
