

## OneGeology Operational Management Group Fifth meeting

9:15-18:00 23 August 2010

Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology, Berlin, Germany

### Attendees:

Name	Country	Representing	Organisation
Asato, Gabriel (GA)	Argentina	SEGEMAR	Servicio Geológico Minero Argentino
Asch, Kristine (KA)	Germany	BGR	Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources
Booth, Kathryn (KB)	UK	OneGeology Secretariat	British Geological Survey
Carter, Mary (MC)	Ireland	GSI	Geological Survey of Ireland
Declercq, Pierre-Yves (PYD)	Belgium	GSB	Geological Survey of Belgium
Demicheli Luca (LD)	Italy	ISPRA	Geological Survey of Italy
Duffy, Tim (TD)	UK	OneGeology Technical Working Group	British Geological Survey
Jackson, Ian (IJ)	UK	OneGeology	British Geological Survey
Komac, Marko (MK)	Slovenia	OneGeology Steering Group	Geological Survey of Slovenia
Raymond, Oliver (OR)	Australia	GA	Geoscience Australia
Pérez Cerdán, Fernando (FPC)	Spain	IGME	Instituto Geológico y Minero de España
Przasnyska Joanna (JP)	Poland	PGI	Polish Geological Institute
Richard, Steve (SR)	USA	AASG, GIN	Arizona Geological Survey
Robida, Francois (FR)	France	OneGeology	Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et Minières
Schubert, Chris (CS)	Germany	BGR	Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources
Simons, Bruce (BS)	Australia	GSV	GeoScience Victoria
Tcheheumeni , Axel (AT)	Cameroon	YES Network	YES Network/Pau University France
Thorleifson, Harvey (HT)	USA	AASG	Minnesota Geological Survey
Tomas Robert (RT)	Czech Republic	(EC Joint Research Council)	EC-JRC / Czech Geological Survey
Tudor, George (GT)	Romania	GIR	Geological Institute of Romania
Uzarraga, Marivic Pulvera (MU)	Thailand	CCOP	CCOP Technical Secretariat
van Daalen, Tirza (TvD)	Netherlands	TNO	Geological Survey of the Netherlands
van der Meulen, Michiel (MvM)	Netherlands	TNO	Geological Survey of the Netherlands
Wakita, Koji (KW)	Japan	GSI	Geological Survey of Japan
Zellmer, Henning (HZ)	Germany	Geoparks Network	Geoparks Network

### Apologies:

John Broome, (Natural Resources Canada), Dave Soller (United States Geological Survey), Randy Orndorff (United States Geological Survey), Cathy Truffert (BRGM), Santiago Munoz Tapia, (Servicio Geológico Nacional, Direccion General de Minería), Urszula Stepien, (Polish Geological Institute) Roberto Page, (Servicio Geológico Minero Argentina) Jose Mendia, (SEGEMAR) Carlos Schobbenhaus, (Serviço Geológico do Brasil) Lee Allison, (Arizona Geological Survey), Paulo Cornejo, (Servicio Nacional de Geología y Minería) Martha Correa, (Servicio Geológico Nacional), Alberto Riccardi, (IUGS).

## 1. Welcome and Introductions (IJ)

1.1 KA welcomed delegates to the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology. Ian Jackson (OneGeology Executive Secretary) thanked Kristine Asch and Chris Schubert (BGR) for hosting and organising the meeting. Brief introductions were made and the agenda was agreed.

## 2. Minutes and Actions from the last meeting in Argentina (IJ)

2.1 The minutes of the last meeting were APPROVED. All outstanding actions were updated as follows;

Action 4.1: Look into how we deal and target training for participants (GeoSciML). It was noted that the IGME (Spain), SEGEMAR (Argentina), CPRM (Brasil), INGEMMET (Perú) and others with the Spanish Development Agency had recently run a training course in South America. This was very successful and there are plans to run further courses. TD and Jean-Jacques Serrano (TWG co-chairs) have also provided training to the Geological Survey of China and the Chinese Academy of Sciences. **ACTION: DISCHARGED.**

Action 4.5: KA was to attempt to encourage more marine data input into OneGeology. KA reported that discussions had been held and it was clear that the data was both a different type and recorded in a very different format/structure to geological map data (e.g. geophysics) therefore any integration would be difficult. The CGI vocabulary working group are aware and are also working on this issue. This will be further discussed in agenda item 13. **ACTION: DISCHARGED.**

Action 4.9: FdB was to circulate information on a new Netherlands Law. TvD reported that the Law is progressing slowly and not yet formally agreed. However, a draft has been translated into English and she will forward this to IJ for information. **ACTION: TvD.**

Action 4.12: ensure OneGeology has a presence at US conferences. SR reported that this is being done, mainly through a presence at the major AGU and GSA conferences. **ACTION: DISCHARGED.**

Action 4.13: this action has been overtaken by events and will be discussed further in agenda item 14. **ACTION: DISCHARGED.**

Action 4.15: Roberto Page was to draft new success criterion addressing user needs. No information has been received by the secretariat. **ACTION REMAINS.**

Action 4.19: Lee Allison was to provide GeoSciML training materials to OneGeology. SR reported that work had been completed on vocabularies and harmonization and that documentation was available on the GeoSciML Twiki. All developments relating to GIN are on the blog website lab however a problem with servers meant this was periodically unavailable. SR AGREED to compile this 'blog' information into a document that can be added to the OneGeology website. **ACTION: SR.**

2.2 TD also AGREED to talk to FPC regarding providing documents from the South America training course. **ACTION: TD, FPC.**

### 3. Operational & Technical progress report and status

3.1 A brief paper summarising progress was supplemented by a PowerPoint presentation. The current status was then discussed.

#### **3a. Operational status**

IJ provided an update and the current status of the initiative: OneGeology had concentrated on progressing two major issues, the ESRI grant offer and the incorporation of OneGeology (to be discussed in agenda item 10). It was reported that the ESRI grant offer had been taken up by at least 16 countries. The 'buddy' system is being increasingly used by c. 17 nations supported by 10 countries. Upcoming events were noted –CAG23, and the GEO ministerial summit in Beijing. New CGMW maps have been added to the portal and 1:50,000 scale map data has been added as a trial. IJ reported that he had ceased to update his Twitter and blogs as he received no feedback. ICSU have identified OneGeology as best practice.

IJ thanked everyone for all they contribute on a voluntary basis.

#### **3b. Technical status**

FR provided an update on the technical status of OneGeology. Statistics included a total of 36 WFS services now being served from 19 different surveys. This number will increase to approximately 25 countries serving a WFS at the end of August when data from the OneGeology-Europe project is transferred across. The visits to the portal were diverse from all regions/countries. A new Cookbook 1 is available on the website as web pages and as a downloadable PDF. The catalogue is now fully compliant with OGC standards and has been tested in conjunction with GEOSS. Further developments will be discussed at the next Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting.

The portal is now Version 3 which incorporates a gazetteer, and 'get information' tool. 1:50K data has been successfully tested. The OneGeology portal is now a reference showcase of OGC for a variety of working groups.

3.2 GA asked for a diagram of the portal structure, FR said he would ask Agnes to update it and forward. **ACTION: FR.**

3.3 TD reported that developments and possibilities will be discussed at the next TWG including 'query clients' WFS services, what we can learn from the OneGeology-Europe project and which aspects can be transferred into OneGeology-global. The added functionality gained from WFS services will hopefully encourage more surveys to contribute. TD reported that, with progression of GeoSciML V3, he is confident that the success criterion for services remains attainable.

### 4. Overview and results of Steering Group Meeting and teleconference

4.1 An overview of the Steering Group (SG) and its membership was provided. The continuing issues with the South & Central America representation were noted. The Steering Group held a meeting in Wellington, New Zealand on 15-16 April 2010 and a teleconference on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010. The minutes of the April meeting were noted. Incorporation of OneGeology was discussed at length and in detail,

the ESRI grant had been approved and was now in operation. The suggestion of a 7-continent model (adding Russia as a separate global region) was noted but is still to be discussed by the SG.

4.2 Regarding the future functionality of OneGeology, the SG had agreed that the capacity to develop the portal to serve more and varied data was an important factor in their considerations but that OneGeology should continue with its current prime aim of geological data coverage until the IGC in 2012. The SG agreed that the main recruitment aims are to involve Russia, India, China and more African countries to serve their data. MK (SG representative for Europe) recognised that trying to engage more African countries was very important.

4.3 Formal feedback from the SG members within their regions was discussed. It was agreed that the minutes of the meetings were the most useful source of feedback.

## **5. OneGeology-Europe: progress review**

5.1 KA provided an overview of the status and a progress update. The OneGeology-Europe project will complete on 31 August 2010 with a closing workshop and final EC review in October 2010 in Paris.

5.2 The key achievements of the OneGeology-Europe project are the delivery of the 20+ interoperable national datasets according to a harmonised vocabulary and a commitment by 20 European Geological Surveys and 29 partners to make this data available for free for download for all users.

5.3 The aims achieved; interoperable data, progress on harmonization, multilingual, provision of use cases, new download services, vocabularies and data specifications. Harmonization was one of the big challenges of the project and this was progressed by developing and using a standard vocabulary. All outputs will be available on a DVD and on the web.

5.4 The data will be migrated into OneGeology-Global and EuroGeoSurveys has agreed to continue to support the OneGeology-Europe portal and metadata.

5.5 The OneGeology-Europe portal has some unique features including one single geological map for Europe, queries can be applied to several services, the final goal is to hide the complexities and provide a single entity for the user. This functionality cannot yet be transferred to the global portal. BS said that the AuScope project has done similar things but doesn't have the capability to display data in the same way.

5.6 It was confirmed that data can be downloaded (under one single simple user licence agreement) and used off-line in any GIS programme.

## **6. OneGeology and the Geoscience Information Network (GIN)**

6.1 An update on progress was provided by SR. The US-based Geoscience Information Network is a regional project which is providing input to OneGeology and supports its goals. GIN recently launched two new websites: US GIN ([www.usgin.org](http://www.usgin.org)) is the primary program site and US GIN Lab ([www.lab.usgin.org](http://www.lab.usgin.org)) is a specialised technical site aimed at developers and programmers.

6.2 Current priorities include developing catalogue services, using ISO standards, and incorporating borehole, geochemical and geothermal data. No WFS services are available yet although it is hoped that a WFS for Arizona will be ready soon. RT asked whether a download service would be available; it would but the licence issue is still to be decided.

6.3 It was agreed to approach Suzette Kimball (USGS/OneGeology Steering Group representative for N America) regarding any issues between the USGS and the State Surveys relating to data provision.

## 7. OneGeology progress in other regions

7.1 A review of progress was provided for Australia, Argentina /S. America and Japan/Asia.

**7a. Australia:** OR provided an update for Australia. GeoScience Australia has just completed a new seamless dataset for the whole of the country. Creation of a WFS service is in progress using GeoServer. Geoscience Victoria has 1:250K scale data in both WMS and WFS formats, available on the portal.

An overview of the AuScope project was provided. This project, similar to OneGeology-Europe, received funding enabling more options to be explored. The project concentrates on mineral resources and its technology is now being rolled out to other countries such as Finland. BS noted that catalogues are also used in this project to deliver the services. It was recognised that a lot of organisations and projects are working independently on similar issues and that more collaboration should be pursued.

**7b. South America/Argentina:** GA provided an update of work in ASGMI, OneGeology, CGI and IUGS who have collaborated to provide a 1:1M geological map of South America and a hazard prevention & mitigation map. Support and collaboration has resulted in the successful delivery of services in the OneGeology portal. This collaboration has been both between South American countries and from Spain and the Netherlands (e.g. Serving data through the buddy system). The recent training course in Columbia covered GeoSciML, XML, WMS/WFS, MapServer, etc. Two new courses are planned for 2011.

The aims are to set up a core working group in South America (2 people from each country) who will train as specialists who can then run further training courses where the need arises. Course 1 will be a practical 'how to serve your data' course where each participant will be asked to bring their 'real' data to work with. Course 2 will focus on advances in GeoSciML for experts (in Spanish). Other courses (e.g. those presented at the Latin American Geological Congress, Argentinean Geological Congress) will also be relevant to OneGeology participants. GA and FPC were asked to forward details and dates to KB/secretariat for inclusion on the OneGeology website. **ACTION: GA, FPC.**

**7c. Japan/Asia:** KW provided an update report for Asia. It was reported that GSJ are nearing completion of the data for Mongolia and Papua New Guinea. Finland will cooperate and serve data on behalf of the Loas Republic. GSJ have written and offered assistance to Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Pakistan, a reply is awaited.

CCOP have a meeting with the China Geological Survey and the Chinese Academy of Sciences in October; KW will encourage data serving. A representative from China is also attending the CGI workshops and KA will speak with him. **ACTION: KW, KA.**

## **8. Linkages with Geoparks Network**

8.1 HZ attended the meeting representing the Geoparks Network. An overview of Geoparks was presented.

8.2 Recent successful discussions and a face to face meeting of the executives have established links and a better understanding between OneGeology and Geoparks. The Geoparks network aims to protect geodiversity, to promote geological heritage to the general public as well as to support sustainable economic development of Geopark territories primarily through the development of geological tourism. This is a different mission to that of OneGeology but there are shared aims. The OneGeology website will also be developed to include more information and linkages to other organisations including geoparks and vice versa. All OMG members were invited to attend the next Geoparks conference 1-5 October 2010 (see [www.petrifiedforest.gr](http://www.petrifiedforest.gr) for more information).

8.3 Discussion concluded that there is considerable overlap between OneGeology and Geoparks e.g. UNESCO, UN, a global remit and it would be a positive step to work together. The idea for the Onegeology accreditation scheme originally stemmed from the Geoparks model. Several OMG members voiced their approval of the collaboration saying that bringing together data and increasing visibility of the geosciences is a very positive and attractive tool. HT gave the example of the National Parks in the US optimising their maps, including geology, for the specific park area. Something similar could be achieved. A clear area of cooperation e.g. the promotion of geology to children, building on the current OneGeology kids web pages, was suggested. It was noted that there would be a semantic issue of harmonisations with underlying geology maps and work would need to be done in this area. It was also suggested that Geopark localities could be added into the OneGeology portal.

8.4 KW noted that the next meeting of the Steering Group will include a visit to a Geopark in Japan and the next Geopark conference will be held in Japan in 2012.

8.5 All agreed that this collaboration would be beneficial to both initiatives and aid to maximise their profile and influence. HZ was thanked for his presentation and for attending the meeting.

## **9. Linkages with YES Network**

9.1 OneGeology has recently become closely involved with the YES Network (Young Earth Scientist). The YES Network invited OneGeology representatives to present and take part in a roundtable discussion at the EGU conference in Vienna in May 2010. The objective of the roundtable was to familiarize the geosciences community with the visible application of geosciences and identify areas of cooperation between YES and OneGeology.

9.2 Axel Tcheheumeni, a member of the YES Network Leadership Team, presented 'Opportunities for OneGeology and YES'. Collaboration and potential opportunities for OneGeology and the YES Network were then discussed.

9.3 The YES Network consists of a wide range of young earth scientists ranging from students, to people from geoscience organisations and commercial companies. 85 countries are involved to date. Africa is continuing to become involved, with Malawi and Morocco recently signed up. Forthcoming conferences that will involved YES sessions include AGU (December 2010), CAG23 (Jan 2011) and IGC (August 2012).

9.4 AT suggested potential collaboration in three ways;

***Education:***

- develop and provide training courses in data standards, GeoSciML, seminars, webinars, etc.
- collaborative research projects in order to help extend the capabilities and applications of OneGeology.

***Cross-organisational collaboration:***

- YES could provide feedback/testing for OneGeology and the portal
- OneGeology could display meta-tags of user-contributed data to make it easier for YES and others to promote, share and collaborate their research.
- OneGeology can alert YES of research and collaboration opportunities.

***Promoters of OneGeology:***

- YES could become the lead promoters of OneGeology data standards
- Members could become key local promoters within their organisation as well can become leaders in addressing issues of data harmony across boundaries and promoting addressing those issues in future data collection efforts before they become codified.
- Link geospatial OneGeology data to projects and ambassadors on the YES Network's website

9.5 The suggested collaboration was positive and beneficial and all agreed that we should move forward. BS said that the testing aspect is an enormous task that we are struggling with so any help would be most welcome. This would not only benefit OneGeology but also the work of the CGI.

9.6 RT suggested a competition to help us define and establish that what we are doing is useful/needed. He agreed to look into options for funding this. **ACTION: RT.** MK reported that the YES Network had recently asked EuroGeoSurveys for additional funding for YES Africa to organise a workshop. This might be a possibility to help them. It was agreed that not many young geoscientists attend CGI council meetings/working group. KA said that this was discussed at Vienna and that it was agreed that YES members should be more involved. It was agreed to discuss this issue at tomorrow's CGI Council meeting. **ACTION: KA.**

9.7 It was agreed to move forward with AT's 'conceptual' suggestions by converting them into actions and assigning an owner to those actions. KB will draft a document and circulate for comment. **ACTION: KB.**

9.8 GA requested a list of YES members in South America. **ACTION: AT**

## **10. Incorporation of OneGeology**

10.1 IJ presented the progress so far regarding the incorporation of OneGeology.

10.2 The basis for OMG discussion was the draft Summary of the process and first draft Articles of Incorporation. The draft Articles and this Summary were requested by the Steering Group and are currently being considered by them. OMG comment will feed into the next drafts of the Articles and this Summary. The OMG were requested to **DISCUSS** the Summary and provide feedback for consideration by the Steering Group and the Secretariat.

10.3 It was clarified that there is a maximum liability on members (an organisation) of £10. Liability of the Directors on the Board is higher but will be covered by an insurance policy. A membership fee model was discounted as not viable.

10.4 RT asked why the link between the advisory committee went directly to the Board and not to the Executive. IJ clarified that this meant the Board received the advice direct, with no filtering by the Executive.

10.5 The question, "why would commercial companies want to fund OneGeology?" was asked. Reasons given were that OneGeology brings all the information together and therefore saves them time and money, cutting data collation expenses further, the sponsor is seen to be supporting a worthy, collective scientific endeavour. IJ pointed the OMG to earlier papers where the full reasons were articulated.

10.6 Membership of any incorporated body is a formal legal act. HT suggested that membership obligations and benefits etc need to be outlined and a precedent used e.g. reference other organisations that already use a similar mechanism and are working well i.e. topographic organisations, IYPE, EuroGeoSurveys, CGMW, AASG. IJ noted this had been set out in earlier incorporation papers.

10.7 Subject to Board decisions, potential recipients of sponsorship would be; the hub providers (BRGM) and training courses in developing nations (demand is high). Any funding received can only be used for the strictly specified 'objects' (objectives) of the CLG. It was felt important that it is confirmed that the objects are broad enough to allow development and growth. It was noted that an organisation can leave the CLG at any time with no penalty.

10.8 MK provided a brief summary of the discussions held by the Steering Group.

10.9 All were asked to provide feedback on the incorporation proposal and what is in the summary by the end of September. This would be included in the dialogue with the Steering Group. **ACTION: All.**



## 11. OneGeology data provider accreditation scheme

11.1 This scheme is intended to provide incentives to improve the accessibility and quality of OneGeology geological map data services. The first version was discussed by the Steering Group in April 2010, and a revised version approved by them for implementation at their telephone conference in July. The OMG were requested to **DISCUSS** the scheme, **AGREE** the logistical and technical details and **PROCEED** with its implementation.

11.2 All agreed that the scheme was a good idea and would provide an incentive to participants; however some reservations were voiced regarding the metadata descriptions and whether the rating should be given on a 'service' basis or an 'organisation' basis. Discussion concluded that practically, the basis had to be an organisation. SR suggested creating a working group to refine the criteria, implement the scheme and roll it out to all members.

11.3 Volunteers for the working group included RT, SR, BS, KA, TD and FR. All OMG members were asked to provide feedback to this working group by 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010. **ACTION: All.**

11.4 The working group agreed to produce a final new scheme by December 2010 for implementation by April 2011. **ACTION: RT, SR, BS, KA, TD and FR.**

## 12. Recruiting new nations and increasing data services

12.1 OneGeology continually works towards increasing participation and data services. This is mainly done through being proactive and direct mailing, website information and conferences/exhibitions. Those nations not yet participating were listed for information. HT presented an overview of the current status of participation. 40% of OneGeology participants are currently serving data to the portal. Most of these services are WMS (Web Map Service). 60% of participant countries are not yet serving their data.

12.2 The OMG were asked to suggest solutions for recruiting new nations, methods of increasing the number of nations serving data, and methods of encouraging more nations to provide more sophisticated WFS services.

12.3 IJ suggested that personal contacts were probably the best option now. TD suggested making the 'joining' information clearer on what they are expected to contribute within a timeframe. TD also reported that SEAMIC were just weeks away from serving data for a further 8 African maps.

12.4 JP said that the Polish Geological Survey would be visited by representatives from Angola and possibly Zambia soon. She would encourage them to serve data. The PGI also has contacts in the Ukraine so will follow up on this at a meeting soon. **ACTION: JP.**

12.5 MK said that at the EGS meeting next month, a proposal for Europe to make available its archives relating to Africa will be made. Hopefully this will be successful and result in an increase in data provision to OneGeology.

12.6 GA reported that in the recent minutes of an ASGMI meeting in Barquisimeto, Venezuela (March 18 2010), participation with CGMW and OneGeology was encouraged. OneGeology should take advantage of this. **ACTION: GA.**

12.7 Mutual consensus to provide data must be secured. GT reported that the service for Romania should be in the portal soon. It was generally acknowledged that new countries were becoming more difficult to involve but that we should concentrate on encouraging those already participating to either serve WMS data or develop their WMS data to provide WFS.

12.8 All agreed to attempt to secure one new country to participate and one participating country to serve data. **ACTION: All.**

### **13. Involving the marine domain**

13.1 Attempts to involve and engage the marine domain and improve access to marine geological data have so far been largely unsuccessful. The OMG were requested to **DISCUSS** potential collaboration and methods to encourage involvement of the marine domain.

13.2 It was acknowledged that marine data in the sense of 'continental shelf' was included in the OneGeology portal, served by the geological surveys, usually as an extension of their onshore map data. However, this item primarily refers to deeper ocean waters.

13.3 It was noted that this type of information is usually in a completely different format i.e. the data records the 'condition' of a rock rather than the lithology or age. FR said that the GeoSeas project is now using GeoSciML and we have been asked by both GeoSeas and E-Modenet to look into serving their data in the portal. This is a valuable first step and could act as a catalyst for others to follow. OR said that the Australian off-shore territories had been substantially extended recently and he would look into whether any data is available. **ACTION: OR.**

13.4 All agreed to look into and use contacts where possible and start to work towards having data as a showcase for the 34<sup>th</sup> IGC. **ACTION: All.**

### **14. Developing the functionality of OneGeology**

14.1 The model and approach which OneGeology has adopted is seen by others as a practical way to make other data accessible, to exchange knowledge and develop standards.

14.2 Suggestions and requests continue to be made about extending functionality, but OneGeology's resources to deal with it are limited. The Steering Group discussed and agreed that the initial aims of OneGeology (to serve geological map data for the world) should remain the focus until the IGC in 2012 and then, options for further development should be considered.

14.3 FR reported that as part of the Steering Group discussions, it was suggested that OneGeology could be used to champion a small set of rock types (15-20) for the non-expert. An overview of this suggestion was provided. A simplified fully harmonized WFS with legend could be provided for 15 rock types. This will provide a demo service that can be used and enable us to move forward and extend the scope of OneGeology. It was suggested that a series of these 'prototype portals' could be developed to be showcased at the IGC. Other options include looking into different ways of listing maps (by region, editor), incorporating intelligent zoom according to the map scale, intelligent queries on the metadata catalogue, etc. Different methods of accessing the data could also be investigated e.g. using iphone apps and other electronic media, making sure that OneGeology is accessible through all channels used today.

14.4 RT suggested that the YES Network (and other users) should be asked for an indication of which of these ideas and suggestions for further development are seen as the most important/wanted. All agreed. KB will collate and send information to AT for circulation and feedback from the YES Network. **ACTION: KB, AT.**

14.5 It was agreed that the Technical Working Group (TWG) would run and be responsible for a test-bed portal in preparation for a showcase demo of possible extended data/functionality at the 34<sup>th</sup> IGC. HT was asked to outline all his ideas and suggestions in an email to all. **ACTION: HT.**

14.6 FR agreed to put the information together and take to the TWG. **ACTION: FR.**

## 15. Success Criteria Review

15.1 In 2008 the Steering Group and the OMG agreed a list of Success Criteria to 2012; these are providing the goals for the OneGeology work programme and are regularly reviewed. The OMG were requested to **REVIEW** the progress of OneGeology in accordance with these success criteria.

15.2 It was agreed that the criteria for determining how many services were available was not clear and didn't identify those organisations who were serving multiple datasets. Therefore, it was agreed to add additional criterion to amend this by adding 1a) No. of geological surveys participating and 2a) no. of geological surveys serving data. **ACTION: KB.**

15.3 Criteria 6: tested a prototype serving high resolution and applied data has already been achieved in the OneGeology-Europe portal.

15.4 Criteria 7: release a service for high resolution and applied data. This will be dependent upon the feedback regarding priorities assigned by YES Network and other users.

15.5 Criteria 8: develop standard geological terminology. This is already on track and proven.

15.6 Criteria 9: number of 3<sup>rd</sup> parties integrating OneGeology services on their website or services. Geoscience Australia and the AuScope project are doing this. We don't necessarily know who is using the data unless they tell us. Perhaps appropriate monitoring of the website could be put into place and/or count the number of downloads requested. A user licence agreement could be set up as is the case for OneGeology-Europe. Participants would need to be asked to take part. It was agreed that the options should be looked into further. **ACTION: FR, IJ, RT.**

15.7 Criteria 18 & 19: not done. All other criteria were either completed or on track.

15.8 Through reviewing the criteria it was realised that some of the aims had been overtaken by events or no longer completely relevant. It was therefore agreed that whilst all current success criteria should remain as a record of progress, new criteria aims could be added. All were asked to review the current criteria and suggest updates and/or new criteria with a view to being achieved by the IGC (August 2012). **ACTION: All.**

## 16. Plans for the IGC34 in 2012

16.1 Plans are in progress for the next IGC (International Geological Congress) in Brisbane in 2012. OneGeology has registered involvement and a basic series of sessions as part of an information

super symposium at the event. It is expected that both the 2012 meetings of the OneGeology Steering Group and the Operational Management Group will take place during this event.

16.2 HT and KA agreed to be involved on the IGC Preparation Committee with the OneGeology secretariat. **ACTION: HT, KA.** OR agreed to nominate someone from GA to assist also. **ACTION: OR.**

### **17. Communications: including ideas for next newsletter**

17.1 Communication and outreach continue to be a high priority for OneGeology. The website is dynamic and is updated at least weekly. Twitter and the OneGeology blog site have been introduced this year. Presentations at conferences and other events are frequently given and articles and papers have also been generated.

17.2 Since June 2009 four editions of the newsletter have been produced with a fifth due for publication following this meeting. The Newsletter is disseminated to over 2000 contacts worldwide.

17.3 The OMG are requested to **SUGGEST** ideas for new content and platforms and to send new ideas for the newsletter and/or articles to KB. **ACTION: All.**

### **18. Workshops, training and conferences (including CAG23)**

18.1 The recent technical workshop held in Colombia in April was attended by representatives from 10 South and Central American countries. OneGeology has also been invited to co-run a workshop at the Colloquium of African Geology (CAG23) in Johannesburg in January 2011. This workshop will be presented as a consortium between OneGeology, AEGOS and GIRAF. OneGeology will also contribute information and materials to the GEO/GEOSS ministerial summit in Beijing in November.

18.2 The OMG are requested to forward information of any relevant forthcoming events and opportunities to the OneGeology secretariat. **ACTION: All.**

### **19. A.O.B.**

19.1 LD informed the OMG of the recent request by the International Atomic Energy Agency of their wishes to meet and discuss using OneGeology data. This is a very positive request and could be beneficial for OneGeology. A meeting is being arranged.

19.2 KW invited Australian colleagues to contribute to SOPAC.

### **20. Date and location of next meeting**

20.1 This is the 5<sup>th</sup> OMG meeting. Previous meetings have been held in Paris, Oslo, Ottawa, and Buenos Aires. OMG members discussed possible locations and dates for their next meeting. It was agreed to synchronise the meeting with other similar events that would decrease travelling. Possibilities included associating the meeting with GIC in Namibia (end May/early June), CGI, alongside the TWG or SG meetings, Salzburg meeting (5-9 September), GIC meeting, or GSA, Minneapolis.

20.2 If none of these proved possible, TvD offered to host the next meeting in the Netherlands and LD offered Genoa.

20.3 KB will collate a list of possibilities and circulate to ascertain the preferred option. **ACTION: KB.**

K A Booth

OneGeology secretariat.

06/09/2010.