Summary of table discussions on the presentations which took place between 0910 and 1150 at the OneGeology Workshop on Thursday 15 March 2007

Introduction

Each table considered the 3 presentations that summarised the results of 3 larger breakout sessions on the morning of Wednesday 14 March.

The 3 larger breakout sessions were each devoted to one of three topics: Geology, Informatics and Project Management. The summary below compiles the results of all the table discussions under these headings. The number in brackets at the end of each statement record the table number that the statement came from. *(Note that unfortunately the contributions from Patrice Christmann's table - Table 8 - could not be included as the file was corrupted.)*

The results of these breakouts and the subsequent table and plenary discussions formed the basis of the first draft of the Brighton Accord which was presented to participants at 1730 on 15 March and subsequently revised between 0900 and 1000 on 16 March to become the final agreed OneGeology Brighton Accord. The intention is that the feedback below will also guide the OneGeology initiative as it moves into its implementation phase.

Reporters for each table:

Table 1: Tim Duffy

Table 2: Leonard Kalindekafe

Table 3: Kristine Asch

Table 4: Martin Peersmann

Table 5: Boyan Brodaric

Table 6: Robert Thomas

Table 7: Manie Brynard

Table 8: Patrice Christmann

Table 9 Lars Kristian Stolen

Table 10: Simon Cox

Responses to the Questions

Question 1: Do you think the geological specification breakout group has dealt satisfactorily with the options, issues and made sensible recommendations?

Adequacy
- No – not close enough to practical use by third parties (1)

Too much overlap between geology and geoinformatics
- The geological specifications group and informatics group had many overlap points – hence the straying into each other´s territories (3)
- Substantial overlap between the Geol. Specification and Informatics break-outs (9)

Aiming too high
- One concern was that web OneGeology is still currently too optimistic (without regional cooperation) (1)

Metadata
- Metadata very good (1)
- Metadata – should receive high priority (7)
- Guidelines required on metadata structure & standard (based on ISO) (7)

Harmonisation
- Long term harmonisation approved (1)
- Long term goal of harmonisation approved (7)

Topographic layer
- The topographic layer does not seem to pose real limitations to the project (2)

Freedom for contributors to chose
- „Each contributor has freedom to decide what to contribute" contrasted with Tim Duffy's graphical presentation which gave another impression (3)
- We like the approach that each contributor has freedom to decide what, when and at what level to contribute (3)

Terminology to be use to describe the different activites
- Stepwise description is a bit unfortunate : steps -> levels (3)

Focus of Product
- User vs. producer focus (10)

Product definition
- Bedrock or superficial (7)
- Data structure & language some unclarities (7)
- What is strategy for "product definition" (10)
    - N.B. Most secondary uses depend on *Lithological* classification (not stratigraphic) (10)
    - Though this is unlikely to be useful at 1:1M … (10)
- Clarification of what is meant by "Level 3 - Harmonization" (10)

Question 2: If the answer is no for the geological specification breakout group – what specifically is unclear or missing or a problem?

Increase Usability outside of Geoscience Community
- Each Geoscience map needs a text (linked perhaps via the metadata entry) that explains the potential uses of this map in the ways that non-Geoscience specialists can understand (1)

- The OneGeology portal needs texts illustrating Geoscience generally in society terms (1)
- There is a need for user-driven specification particularly for steps 2 and 3 (2)
- Requirements from users outside our community (5)
  - Create a group to define user requirements (5)
  - Improve the way we deliver legends (5)
  - User centric applications require level 2 conformance (5)
  - Build in the system a way to get end user feedback (5)
  - Linking to non geological content (5)
  - Connect with land cover, agriculture, soils, hydrology,…sources (5)
  - Provide if available related maps : groundwater resources, mineral resources, Hazard maps, pollution, tectonic (5)
  - Link with 3D models if available (5)
  - Geoparks, Pictures of geological landscapes (quizz) (5)
  - GSJ might make available ASTER satellite imagery (5)

Building technology capability
- It is advisable to start preparing a 'cookbook' on technical specifications (especially for Steps 2 and 3) (2)

Multilingual
- Need for multilingual thesaurus for legends translation, so exactly same concepts are used (ISO codes), the recommendation is to use the international multilingual geological thesaurus (3)

Harmonisation
- Reference to harmonisation should be delayed to the last levels of the project (3)
- Other regional initiatives can be important drivers regarding harmonisation (i.e. INSPIRE directive, AEGOS proposal) (9)
- Clarification of what is meant by "Level 3 - Harmonization" (10)

Priorities
- Semantics has a priority (4)
- There is a need for Common Identifiers and a common language (9)

Scale
- NSO decide the scale, however preferably 1M (4)
  - Zoom facility from 25 M to 5 M to 1M and then to regional and local maps should be possible. (4)
  - Gaps as white spots should be shown at the different zoom levels (white spots no problem!!!!) (4)

Clarifying the levels and conformance
- Level 1 on a 1G standard is compulsory before proceeding to level 2, 3…(4)..
- For those contributors which want to enter already on level 2 or 3 content definitions have to be developed (4)
- How do we keep Level 1 and Level 2/3 synchronized?? (4)
- Step 1 – digital atlas of GM's should be planned to be completed sooner…IGC OSLO (6)
- Conformance: (10)
  - Level 1 (WMS) (10)
    - Use case is "geologic map portrayal" (10)
    - Specification is "stuff that looks like geological maps (10)
  - Level 2 (GIS) (10)

- Primary use case is "maintenance of geologic maps (including assimilation and compilation)" (10)
- Specification is "GeoSciML" (10)
- Other use-cases? (10)

Content
- Pure lithology is important!! (4)
- Missing general guidance about geological content of the 1G project (6)
- Regional approach will be applied to the geological specifications (6)
- Bedrock or superficial (7)
- Data structure & language some unclarities (7)
- Surficial deposits map just as important as bedrock (depending on the region) (9)
- What is strategy for "product definition" (10)
  - N.B. Most secondary uses depend on *Lithological* classification (not stratigraphic) (10)
  - Though this is unlikely to be useful at 1:1M … (10)
-

Scale
- Relax the focus of 1:1M scale. Contribute with what you have. (9)

Project Structure
- Project structure for continuation …? (10)

Question 3: Do you think the geoinformatics breakout group has dealt satisfactorily with the options, issues and made sensible recommendations?

Adequacy of the geoinformatics specification
- Happy with the recommendations (especially the support) (1)
- Very clear presentation, even for non-specialists (3)
- No issues (7)
- Very strong detailed recommendations!! (10)

Centralised, Distributed or Hybrid model
- The hybrid system is considered to be the best option. Those countries that are unable to host their own server should be identified and it should be evaluated how to assist them (2).
- Endorse decentralized points (5)
- Distributed model (9)

Authorship
- Approved the recommendations concerning authorship (2)

Support team
- The support team is considered a necessary step (2)

Specifications on the further levels
- Specific involvement and levels of participation should be further discussed and agreed through a technical 'ad hoc' workshop (2)

Time it will take to develop
- What software tools are available today, can we make a demonstrator fast (4)

Levels
- Level 1 & 1M geological map we regards as "the gateway to geology for society" (4)

Specifics of Topography layer
- the complex issue of the usage of a common topographical layer was not debated enough (6)

Gaps in data
- Concerned about the gaps but happy the idea that 1:5M can temporarily fill them and that areas with just paper maps can be scanned and served 1G (1)

Countries that do not have the capabilities
- What happens to Countries which only have paper maps, but no budget or facilities? Is funding needed or will a scanning service be provided by other Surveys.
- Final data should be stored in regional data centres for those who can't host their own data (9)
- Use of GeoSciML? Yes we agree, but what is it? No alternatives. (9)
- Cookbooks are necessary!
- Regional workshops are important to knowledge/technology transfers (9)

Logistics
- Time table is important! (9)
- Put OneGeology in operation! And then learn from implementation and go into more detail. (9)

Multilinguistics
- Multilinguistics is necessary but in the beginning use own language and English (9)

Question 4: If the answer is no for the geoinformatics specification breakout group – what specifically is unclear or missing or a problem?

Open Source
- OGC and Open Source approach requires expertise within each survey (after training and capacity building) whereas commercial vendor specific approaches costs lots money – OGC and Open Source MUST have capacity building costs otherwise it will not work, however commercial costs ARE greater therefore OGC and Open Source is the cheaper option and thus more sustainable but there IS the capacity building cost which must be resourced (1)

Useability
- OGC default 'interface' is very un-user friendly – the client on the 1G portal needs to be very carefully designed with consultation across 1G to ensure ease1)-of-use of the human machine and 2) clear tutorial on scope of use (1)
- what user interface do we provide for non professionals (general public, decision makers)? (4)

Grouping of Contributions
- contributions could be grouped at the level of continents or regions, concentrated in a continental focal point (sometimes requiring political approval, e.g. in Africa): this should be made possible (3)

Outreach
- CGI is organising outreach workshop in Namibia. We recommend that a GeoSciML short course be included (3)

Connection with other groups
- CGMW-DIMAS offer : geological specification input (3)
- Emphasize connection with SDI initiatives (5)

Enhancements
- Provide access to not only large scale map data but also for example by hotlinks, search engine to e.g.: (4)
  - Detailed local maps,
  - Thematic maps (e.g.risk/hazard maps)
  - Documents, reports
  - Detailed measured data
- Consider harvesting model (specially for metadata) (5)
- Emphasize harmonization of metadata (5)
- May require multiple conformance profiles, even within "Level 2" (10)
  - E.g. which queries supported, (10)
    - Does it support server-side re-classification? (10)
    - Can it be queried by alternative classifiers? (10)

Users
- Who are the users of the level 2/3 (4)

Resources
- Importance of sufficient computer and human resources for 1G infrastructure (portal, registry…) (5)
- Resourcing the "support-team" (10)

Multilingual
- Possibility to deliver data in original language and in English (5)
- Multi-lingual considerations …(10)

Technology capability building
- Importance of cookbooks for preparing data (digitization…) (5)
- Emphasize need for training – support for GeoSciML (5)
- To stress the importance of capacity building activities (knowledge transfer, IT governance etc.) to developing countries (3 groups of countries - good idea) (6)

Question 5: Do you think the project management breakout group has dealt satisfactorily with the options, issues and made sensible recommendations??

Adequacy of Project Management Specifications
- Accept recommendations (1)
- In general very positive impression! (9)

Make up of Steering Committee
- Steering Committee, Chairman outside Geoscience community ok (4)

Resourcing
- Applicationrer(s) & higher resolution data being interoperable – clarity required (7)

Cost recovery
- Data at low or no cost – how will the cost recovery work if a nation chooses that option (7)

Regional nodes
- Guidelines required for the establishment of regional nodes (7)

Project Structure
- Project structure has to be specified (9)

Management Structure
- Addressed high-level "Steering Committee" (10)
  - How to transition to a **project** (10)
  - How to structure next level management: (10)
  - Regional coordination (10)
  - Technical coordination (10)
  - Success criteria? (10)

End User
- Define end user needs more exactly. (Maybe incorporate a questionnaire in the portal to find the interests of the users.) (9)
- Need our external story to be stronger (10)
  - Why 1G? What for? (10)
  - Too producer focussed? (10)
  - Story may need to be adapted for different markets (status of geosciences is not a problem in some jurisdictions) (10)
  - Capacity-building & training is one of the key rationales (10)
- Private sector engagement? (10)
  - Transactional function – writing as well as reading! (10)

Question 6: If the answer is no for the Project Management specification breakout group – what specifically is unclear or missing or a problem?

Cost Recovery
- Would like a stronger statement that the 1:1M data *should* be free, accessible and useable (1)

Clarification on regional groups
- It has not been discussed how many geographical areas representatives will 'populate' the Steering Committee (2)
- if institutions are grouped together for the purpose of continental cooperation (focus group), who will be responsible for the data ? -> answer: is foreseen in the WMS metadata and IPR statements (3)

Organisation of Governance
- There should be a clearly defined hierarchical structure with: Steering Committee, Executive Secretary and Technical Group (2)
- It is proposed that technical issues are dealt with by a Technical Group in support of the Steering Committee and Executive Secretary to provide specific advice (2)
- A temporal term of 1 year appears to be too limited for evaluating the mandate of the Executive Secretary. A two-year mandate is more appropriate, as this will cover extent of IYPE (2)
- The temporal term of the Steering Committee should be 2 yrs, through a rotation mechanism (2)
- we suggest that the steering committee members be chosen with great care so as to include the global bodies and private sector as well (3)
- what is the time line for the choice of the steering committee and secretariat ? - Our answer would be: we have a year to decide on this while the temporary secretariat is in operation. Furthermore: we have experts in this room to help us on this. (3)
- Steering Com. Restrict to reps of 5/6 regions (each continent) (4)
- Advice the following working groups (4)
    - Geological content (incl. Semantics) (4)
    - ICT tech/standards (4)
    - Outreach (users voice, make OneGeology demand driven) (4)
    - Sponsor acquisition/Fund raising (4)
    - When funding obtained who will be the keeper of the funds – the Bank? (4)
- decides when conflicts between different map products (5)

Collaboration with external groups
- What about the maps of technical cooperation that were produced e.g in Europe or N America? Copyright? (3)

Wording
- our words smithing contribution: „absence from this meeting does NOT necessarily imply lack of interest"(3)

Ownership
- At the moment, can we attribute the OneGeology activity to any specific organisation ? Answer: at present we should refer to the individual national geological surveys as the „owners". (3)

Timing of deliverables
- Make available what we have today. We need it for sponsor acquisition and political support! (4)

Enhancements
- Emphasize harmonization of metadata (5)
- Mission statement needs some rewording: (6)
    - Dividing into 2-3 sentences (but keep it short) (6)
    - 'a GS project' - too strong, exclusive but the leading role of GS is clear (6)
    - ' for use by society' - addressing the global society issues... (6)
- What will be the status of 1G initiative (association, federation…?) (5)
- Benefits of the 1G project for other groups of society (educations, global environmental issues, mining industry etc..) (6)
- What process to join the initiative (open, gate keeper, …)? (5)

Future commitments
- Duration of project, maintenance of services post OneGeology? (10)

Question 7: Are there any other points you wish to raise?

Connection with other groups
- As well as GlobalMap topography layer give clear links within the 1G portal to recommend using GlobalMap landcover, drainage and landuse layers for combination with geoscience layers (1)
- In the portal client try to recommend a common hierarchy of these other layers being overlaid for the whole world e.g. as in Google Earth (1)

Conferences
- Suggest a conference about 1G results bringing the 1G contributors together at least once every 2-3 years (1)

Recommended Scale
- Small island nations must be allowed to contribute scales less than 1:500000 (be the exception) as they disappear at scales of 1:500000 or more (1)

Original Questionnaire
- With increased understanding gained in the workshop could we re-evaluate the questionnaire after this workshop (2)

Regional Centres
- What is the make-up of the regional coordination centres and how many should be created (2)

Brighton Accord
- we have now a much clearer idea what OneGeology is about, and look forward to „Brighton Accord" and the technical „cookbooks" for more specific guidance (3)

Group vs Individual Initiatives
- Could group initiatives be more valuable (in some cases) than individual initiatives, and how can we handle this? (3)

Metadata
- will INSPIRE (meta)data be automatically incorporated in OneGeology ? yes, but the input (WMS, GeoSciML) will not be much work (3)

Technical Support
- We foresee technical problems, so we support the idea of a technical help team to support us with them! (3)

Performance Criteria
- Performance measurement criteria (7)
- Adopt ICGM criteria (7)
- Table 5 mentioned user needs – this can be used as a basis for performance criteria (7)
- Feedback from users (7)

Cooperation post workshop

- How will cooperation continue after the Brighton Workshop? (9)

Project concept

- The Concept of the Project (multilateral, multinational approach) is right! (9)