



OneGeology Operational Management Group Sixth meeting

09:00-17:30 Friday 1st July 2011
British Geological Survey, Edinburgh, UK

Attendees:

Name	Country	Representing	Organisation
Allison, Lee (LA)	USA	AASG, GIN	Arizona Geological Survey
Asato, Gabriel (GA)	Argentina	SEGEMAR	Servicio Geológico Minero Argentino
Asch, Kristine (KA)	Germany	BGR	Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources
Broome, John (JB)	Canada	NRC	Natural Resources Canada
Carter, Mary (MC)	Ireland	GSI	Geological Survey of Ireland
Cipolloni, Carlo (CC)	Italy	ISPRA	Geological Survey of Italy
Demicheli Luca (LD)	Italy	EuroGeoSurveys	EuroGeoSurveys
Duffy, Tim (TD)	UK	OneGeology Technical Working Group	British Geological Survey
Jackson, Ian (IJ)	UK	OneGeology	British Geological Survey
Lee, Katy (KL)	UK	OneGeology Secretariat	British Geological Survey
Mendía, José (JM)	Argentina	SEGEMAR	SEGEMAR
Myciuk, Kamil (KM)	Poland	PGI	Polish Geological Institute
Nguno, Anna (AN)	Namibia	Geological Survey Namibia	Geological Survey Namibia
Passmore, James (JP)	UK	OneGeology Technical Working Group	British Geological Survey
Percival, Dale (DP)	Australia	GA	GeoScience Australia
Przasnyska Joanna (AP)	Poland	PGI	Polish Geological Institute
Rattenbury, Mark (MR)	New Zealand	GNS	GNS Science
Robida, Francois (FR)	France	OneGeology	Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et Minières
Simons, Bruce (BS)	Australia	GV	GeoScience Victoria
Stölen, Lars Kristian (LKS)	Sweden	GSS	Geological Survey of Sweden
Tomas Robert (RT)	Czech Republic	(EC Joint Research Council)	EC-JRC / Czech Geological Survey
van Daalen, Tirza (TvD)	Netherlands	TNO	Geological Survey of the Netherlands
Wakita, Koji (KW)	Japan	GSI	Geological Survey of Japan

Apologies:

Pierre-Yves Declercq, Geological Survey of Belgium; Carlos Schobbenhaus, Serviço Geológico do Brasil (CPRM); Urszula Stepień; Polish Geological Institute; George Tudor, Geological Institute of Romania; Marko Komac, Geological Survey of Slovenia; Richard Hughes, British Geological Survey; Harvey Thorleifson, University of Minnesota, Minnesota GS; Dave Soller, US Geological Survey; Steve Richard, Arizona Geological Survey; Fraser Taylor, International Steering Committee for Global Mapping (ISCGM), Phillipe Rossi, CGMW; Patrick McKeever, Geoparks Network; Jo Venus, YES Network.

1. Welcome and Introductions (IJ)

- 1.1 IJ welcomed delegates to the Edinburgh office of the British Geological Survey. The Agenda was AGREED with no amendments. Apologies were noted and comments were forwarded on behalf of the YES Network (see Appendix 1).

2. Minutes and Actions from last OMG Meeting (Berlin, 23 August 2010)

- 2.1 The minutes from the previous meeting were APPROVED with no changes.
- 2.2 The outstanding actions from the previous meeting were reviewed as follows:
- Action 5.2: no information has yet been received, action remains on Roberto Page.
- Action 5.3: progress not known, action remains.
- Action 5.4: a PowerPoint from the training course is available on the web.
- Action 5.5: FR reported that a new version of the portal was recently made available for testing so he will ask Agnes Tellez-Arenas to complete this action.
- Action 5.9: action remains. RT will look into potential funding and how to run the competition.
- Action 5.10: discharged. The YES Network has been invited to CGI meetings but have not yet been able to attend.
- Action 5.17: action discharged but Bolivia has not yet joined OneGeology.
- Action 5.18: action remains ongoing but it is becoming increasingly difficult to encourage new countries to participate.
- Action 5.19: progress not known. Action remains on Ollie Raymond.
- Action 5.20: action remains.
- Action 5.21: KL will follow up on progress on this action with the YES Network.
- Action 5.23: action remains on Harvey Thorleifson.
- Action 5.24: action remains, dependent upon action 5.23.
- Action 5.26: action remains. IJ reported that OneGeology-Europe now has some user cases, colleagues in the oil and gas sector (NefTex) have tested the data in the portal and provided constructive feedback. A full report is available which IJ will circulate for information.
- ACTION: IJ.**
- Action 5.27: action remains.
- Action 5.28: action remains. The call for IGC business meetings has just gone out. IGC planning will be discussed in agenda item 13.
- Action 5.29: action remains.
- Action 5.30: ongoing.
- Action 5.31: ongoing.

3. Operational & Technical progress report and status

- 3.1 IJ presented the progress report and status since the last meeting. Progress was reported against the 4 Onegeology objectives: improve the accessibility of geological map data, exchange know-how and skill, accelerate interoperability in the geosciences, and use global profile to increase awareness of the project & relevance of the geosciences.
- 3.2 It was NOTED that the OneGeology Steering Group now comprises 7 Directors, one for each continent, now including Eurasia. The nominated representative of Eurasia has yet to be confirmed.
- 3.3 The next meeting of the Steering Group has been rearranged for 27-28 September in Tokyo. Due to the meetings postponement, a teleconference was held to progress the urgent items.

- 3.4 Two main tasks were taken forward over the last year – the successful completion of the OneGeology-Europe project, and progress on the incorporation of OneGeology. In addition, OneGeology has strengthened linkages with the Geoparks Network and met with Map Action, the international humanitarian organisation which provides responsive mapping capability in disaster zones (e.g. Pakistan and Haiti).
- 3.5 Despite efforts, the national participant number remains at 116 countries, however the number of state/provincial surveys participating and serving data has increased. These include Australia: Victoria; USA: Arizona, Kentucky, Illinois; Canada: Manitoba, Newfoundland & Labrador, Ontario. LA noted that Kentucky and Illinois are hubs within the GIN Network so along with Arizona, will soon be bringing together data from all the US States.
- 3.6 The possibilities of other countries providing state/provincial information e.g. Germany, Italy were discussed. European countries are currently focussing their efforts into complying with the INSPIRE Directive.
- 3.7 It was recommended that OneGeology needs to be more actively marketed in Australia and the benefits explained more clearly because there is no technical reason why any of the States cannot serve 1G-compliant data.
- 3.8 EuroGeoSurveys (EGS) are currently collating information to create a database of data holdings for Africa. It is hoped that this library will then be available to these countries and further discussions can be held regarding what data can be made available for free.
- 3.9 JP provided an update on progress with the Russian service. The maps and legends need to be merged together to make a coherent OneGeology data service and solutions to do this are being considered. JP will speak with Agnes Tellez-Arenas (ATA) to discuss further.
ACTION: JP.
All were encouraged to use the forthcoming IGC conference to encourage data providers to serve their data.
- 3.10 FR presented the technical progress of OneGeology. There are currently 229 WMS and 23 WFS data layers being served through the portal. Current areas of improvement include zoom and scale changes. The stats recorded 128,000 visits to the portal in the last 9 months. A new version of OneGeology portal (updates, user interface improvements, new version of catalog) has recently been released. The OneGeology-Europe project has delivered 20 national Web Feature Services which are using a harmonised European chronostratigraphic and lithological data specification (consistent with IUGS-CGI specifications). This is a global first. The multi-lingual aspect of this work is also very important. The technical Cookbooks are regularly updated and feedback from users concludes that they are very useful tools. A new WFS Cookbook will be drafted soon.
- 3.11 CC provided a brief review of the TWG meeting in Ghana last year. KA provided a brief review of the CAG23 joint workshop (OneGeology, GIRAF and AEGOS), which approximately 30 participants attended. The next GIRAF meeting was noted – Darussalam in December 2011.
- 3.12 It was reported that the ESRI grant offer had received very good uptake and ESRI have received more requests than expected which is good news. To date, 15 countries are successfully using the 'buddy' system. The successful connection with GEO/GEOSS has provided high visibility to OneGeology in different areas of science and SDI's. OneGeology is one of the few, if not the only, deployed global dataset in GEOSS. JB reported that within the Co-Data community, OneGeology is seen as being very successful in integrating data from multiple-communities. As well as interest in the technical aspects, organisations are also increasingly interested in the organisational and communication aspect of the project. Many organisations quote and use OneGeology as an example and it is seen as functioning very well. RT noted that the 'Global Soil Map' project is based on the 1G concept.

- 3.13 The transferability of 1G-E functionality to the 1G-global portal was discussed. This is not an easy process because the 1G-E portal relies on harmonized data. The latter is not currently available globally. The issues will be discussed at the TWG meeting next week. **ACTION: Technical Working Group.**

4. Steering Group teleconference

- 4.1 A brief review of the Steering Group teleconference was provided. The full minutes of the meeting were provided in the OMG papers for information.

5. Incorporation of OneGeology

- 5.1 IJ presented an overview of the proposal and progress. Incorporation is intended to give OneGeology greater security, stability, sustainability, accountability and transparency. It will have a separate legal entity and therefore have a bank account enabling it to accept sponsorship. At 7 April 2011 teleconference Steering Group agreed unanimously to proceed with incorporation – acknowledging that initially it would have a core of members, together with associates and that the Articles must reflect this scenario.
- 5.2 The articles for the company are currently being drafted by BGS/NERC lawyers. When complete the Memorandum and Articles will be sent for consideration and signature to all participants (c. August).
- 5.2 It was acknowledged and understood that not everyone will be able to become a full member but they can be associates. This means that the CLG will have a ‘core’ of initial members who will continue to run OneGeology operationally. Sponsorship will also be sought and the appointed Board will decide on how best to spend this funding. Many countries who are unable to become full members have already indicated that they will continue to support and be involved in OneGeology. It is hoped that over time and with greater success, more countries will want to be members of the incorporated core. It is hoped that a minimum 12 countries will sign-up initially and these will form the ‘core’ of OneGeology CLG.
- 5.3 It was noted that OneGeology CLG will be very similar to other organisations such as OGS, CGMW, EGS, IYPE, etc. so for organisations already members of these bodies, it should not be a problem being a member of OneGeology CLG also.
- 5.4 It was agreed that we should preserve what allowed 1G to be so successful and move forward with this mechanism that allows the funding problems to be solved. Once funding and sustainability has been gained, 1G could then potentially look towards creating an association under international law; however to try to do that now and abandon the current path to incorporation would mean delaying for at least 12 months and putting the future sustainability of OneGeology at risk.
- 5.5 It was AGREED that the ‘core functionality’ of OneGeology (i.e. the work done by BGS and BRGM at the ‘hub’) needs to be specifically defined and this will allow other countries and organisations to offer assistance and to take on tasks. LA provided an example using the Earthscope Network which uses a 3-5 year rolling management contract that is bid for amongst organisations. OneGeology could use a similar model. FR and IJ AGREED to stipulate the current functions and the resources required to run the OneGeology project. **ACTION: IJ, FR.**
- 5.6 It was NOTED that we need to form a policy and proposal on how we will take 1G forward and that should be ready before the IGC.
- 5.7 LA said that AASG will commit to signing up to OneGeology CLG.

6. OneGeology data provider accreditation scheme

- 6.1 FR presented the objectives and background to the OneGeology accreditation system. The principal has been approved by the Steering Group and previously discussed by the OMG and TWG. The process of application was outlined and the requirements for attaining each level were discussed. The system will be implemented in July 2011. **ACTION: OneGeology secretariat.**
- 6.2 RT raised the importance of having a clear and transparent evaluation procedure. JP confirmed that reference to the star ratings will be added into the Cookbook. It is hoped to ultimately install an automated system for checking the level criteria. This is currently being investigated. IJ confirmed that the checking procedure will include 1) a check of the technical criteria by members of the TWG, and 2) a check of the operational/access criteria by a member of the OMG. Following checking, full and positive feedback will be provided to the applicant.
- 6.3 It was agreed that now was a good time to launch this system as there is lots of interest within the geological and other SDI and standards communities. It also coincides with the INSPIRE work which is just starting to look at conformance issues. The system will be flexible and can be adjusted over time depending on needs. It was acknowledged that some organisations serve a number of data services that might be a variety of different levels/star ratings. It is intended that the star rating will be awarded to an organisation as a whole rather than to an individual service.

7. Success Criteria Review

- 7.1 JB provided an overview and led a discussion of the currently applicable OneGeology success criteria. Progress with participants and services appears to be good and progressing towards the 2012 target (criteria 1 and 2).
- 7.2 Criteria 6: tested a prototype service for high resolution and applied data. This criterion has been achieved through the OneGeology-Europe project where 1:50K scale data was tested and applied data was tested across mutual borders (e.g. Germany, Belgium, France, etc.). There were no technical issues but issues of harmonization and differences in scientific approach between different countries became more visible. For example there are many different approaches to analysing landslide or flood hazard which has not yet been reconciled. This means that Criteria 7 (release a service for high resolution and applied data) is not being done.
- 7.3 Criteria 8: develop and initial version of a standard geological terminology. This is being progressed through the CGI.
- 7.4 Criteria 19: establish a sub-committee to produce a policy on different channels (university, commerce, public). This criterion is no longer relevant and is not being pursued.
- 7.5 Criteria 23: begin to negotiate with potential sponsors. This criterion is dependent upon incorporation of OneGeology.
- 7.6 Criteria 29: Engage and involve the offshore community. The only progress on this has been with CGMW who are serving data in the marine domain. The marine community, despite attempts, have yet to get effectively involved in OneGeology.

8. OneGeology-Europe: next steps

- 8.1 TvD presented a summary of the Onegeology-Europe project and a review of the potential next steps. The project ended October 2010 and since then there had been lots of discussion about how to move forward. 18 languages are available in a discovery metadata catalogue.

- 8.2 The team have ensured the sustainability of the project by: 20 national geological surveys have agreed to keep serving their data; EGS has agreed to fund the maintenance of the portal.
- 8.3 Currently, the feasible progress options include extending the data coverage e.g. to incorporate other European nations e.g. Switzerland and Austria; and improving the data resolutions, quality, harmonization.
- 8.4 Other options for the longer term might include integrating the infrastructure into other domains; developing pan-European derived datasets (e.g. radon, flooding, ground stability); improving the services, applications and functionality; and developing schematic interoperability in 3D.
- 8.5 An application for the iPhone was discussed however technical issues would mean that further development would be necessary in order to cope with many different service providers.
- 8.6 FR confirmed that only a small amount of work is needed to make all 1G-E services 100% INSPIRE compliant. A further FP7 project, 'Pangeo', containing geological/geohazard data for 50+ European cities will be released soon and this data can also be served via the Portal.
- 8.7 The ideas need further discussion within EGS. It is hoped that initial discussions will take place at the EGS Warsaw meeting followed by detailed discussions and decisions to be taken in the next EGS Strategy Workshop at the end of the summer.

9. Developing OneGeology

- 9.1 JB presented an overview of the potential future objectives for discussion. These ideas were the result of a brainstorming session and were presented in no particular order.
- 9.2 A simple lithology legend for all services was considered. KA said that a legend comprising just 27 rock types had already been created as part of the INSPIRE Geology ThemeV2. All AGREED that this could be what this OneGeology action needed and it should be examined. OneGeology could also look at adopting an appropriate IUGS-CGI governed simple lithology that could be used when GeoSciML standards are used. KA will forward the INSPIRE derived legend to the OneGeology secretariat. **ACTION: KA.**
- 9.3 Discussion on the development of an iPhone app concluded that although it was a good idea and can be done through using a data cache, caution is needed for the issue of scale (1:1M scale data is not suitable for local use as an app would most likely be; and data IPR needs to be considered. Cloud options for the infrastructure could also be considered.
- 9.4 Improving metadata content and quality (including persistent identifier) would become more important with the inclusion of more data. This would make the data and services more sustainable.
- 9.5 It was AGREED a good idea to use the portal to show the location (and link to) of all IGC abstracts. This would provide a geographical context for abstracts and increase the profile of OneGeology and IGC. BS AGREED to take the request to the IGC organisers and to request that a spatial reference is included on all the submitted abstracts. The author will decide the spatial reference that best suits. **ACTION: BS.**
- 9.6 An additional suggestion was added to the list – extension of the functionality of the 1G-E portal into 1GG.
- 9.7 All delegates used 5 votes to then prioritise the list of potential future objectives. The results were:

Priority #	# of votes	Potential Objective	Case	Impact
1	14	Simple (15?) lithology legend for all	Incomprehensibility of geology data to user community currently	Improves accessibility
2	11	Harmonising terms and concepts (semantic interoperability)	Adds value to national datasets not originally there	National data becomes internationally relevant
3	9	Single simple licence agreement allowing any use of 1:1million for free	Increase usage of data. Clarity for user and reassurance for provider	Elimination of barrier/ambiguity of use
3	9	Mobile/iPhone geospatial application	1G needs to be accessible to mobile users (and youth)	Very high communications and PR value
5	7	Improve metadata content and quality (including persistent identifier)	Inability to cite and trace content	Makes data and services more sustainable
5	7	Improved topographic base layer	Greatly improves usability (and addresses a constant complaint)	Geological data seen in context
5	7	Use portal to show location (and link) of all IGC abstracts	Provide a geographic context for abstracts	Increase profile of OneG and IGC
8	6	Facilitate bilateral integration with other science domains (e.g. groundwater data or beyond geoscience)	Societal problems are multidisciplinary and 1G cannot address alone	Broader more relevant application of geological data
9	4	Use geological units as a proxy for a useful attribute (e.g. alluvium for flood risk)	Facilitate application of geology to societal issues	Geology seen to be more relevant
10	3	Cloud options for the infrastructure	Individual participants share the burden of the infrastructure load	Distributed cost
11	2	Extend and intensify technical and knowledge exchange and outreach activity in less well developed countries	Global need – and can make a big difference	Synergistic – helps the less well developed countries and 1G
12	1	Involve the private and academic sectors and implement a crowd sourcing portal	There have been many requests over 4 years from these communities	Makes more data available
13	0	Increasing data resolution (possibly up to 1:50K)	More useful to clients	Incremental – not a paradigm shift
13	0	Consistent single global geology data feed	ditto	ditto
13	0	Identify needs and forge productive alliances with relevant initiatives	Sharing best practice (e.g. success of 1G as an international consortium and process)	Raises visibility and builds partnerships

9.8 All were asked to forward any additional suggestions. **ACTION: All.**

9.9 The list will be prioritised and further information will be provided for the top 5 choices. A paragraph detailing the proposed idea/objective, and the estimated time it will take to achieve will be drafted and circulated for comment. **ACTION: JB, FR.**

10. Geoscience Information Network (GIN) & related US initiatives

10.1 LA presented an update on progress within the US GIN and NSF initiatives. The US GIN is a distributed web-based interoperable open source network bringing together geological map data, databases and collections for the US. A different business model is now in use, SGS 2.0, where the State Geological Surveys (SGS) build capacity and services that can be marketed to agencies, industry and academia rather than the traditional route of lobbying congress for a USGS programme. The USGS have validated the data integration method and Energistics and AASG have recently adopted GIN. New partnerships are emerging in a wide variety of areas e.g. oceans, atmospheres, earth sciences, environment and international linkages. The

- most recent partnership is with the Defence Department which is funding an initiative to create a GIS database and will form a node within the GIN network.
- 10.2 A report detailing the US GIN Strategic Plan is due for release in August 2011. The Department of Energy are funding the National Geothermal data System \$38M over 3-5 years. Data from all 50 states will be entered into this web based, distributed, interoperable, open source network. A series of hubs will provide training and support centres and training material will be available. The prototype system will be rolled out summer 2011.
- 10.3 LD said that 1G needed to grow and one possibility would be to include other types of data such as this. LA confirmed that all US State Surveys are being encouraged to serve their data in the OneGeology portal. It is hopeful that more States will be serving data this year and LA offered to work to improve the US coverage of services in OneGeology. **ACTION: LA.**
- 11. Recruiting new nations and increasing data services**
- 11.1 The papers OMG6/08 (countries not participating) and OMG6/09 (participants not serving any data) were discussed. All were asked, where possible, to contact countries and encourage them to a) Join OneGeology; b) Serve WMS or WFS data as appropriate.
- 11.2 Suggestions were made by region as follows:
- Asia
- 1) China: China appears to be developing its own portal. OneGeology may propose a reciprocity agreement. China may also have concerns that OneGeology is somehow in conflict with CGMW. IJ: to talk to Manuel Pubellier (CGMW) and a Chinese contact (Wang Yun). **ACTION: IJ.**
- KA : To discuss during a coming BGR visit to China. **ACTION: KA.**
- 2) India: Are there data? Someone should discuss with Haj Gupta at the IGC or earlier. IJ to pursue communications. **ACTION: IJ.**
- 11.3 Africa
- AN - Indicated that Djibouti and Mozambique are interested. There is a meeting of the African Association of Geological Surveys Sept 26/27 and this would be a good place for OneGeology to seek new members.
- KA: CGI has a Dec. "GIRAF" workshop and this represents another opportunity to promote OneGeology.
- LD. had contacts in Morocco and will approach them. **ACTION: LD.**
- It was noted that South Africa has declared it is willing to host African Geoscience Data for other countries.
- 11.4 Europe
- It was noted that oil companies are looking for improved data access through OneGeology. TD indicated that he can approach Iceland directly or through a contact. **ACTION: TD**
- LD: Indicated he can approach Montenegro through a contact. **ACTION: LD.**
- Poland indicated it can contact the Ukraine and encourage it to join. **ACTION: AP**
- LD indicated to be available for a joint action with IJ to contact European countries who are not already members. **ACTION: LD, IJ.**
- 11.5 Oceania
- BS agreed to contract non-member Australian states. **ACTION: BS**
- IJ agreed to contact IGC organizers re. the impact of blank areas on the OneGeology Portal. **ACTION: IJ.**
- BS agreed to contact New Guinea re. OneGeology membership. **ACTION: BS**
- 11.6 Americas
- JB will continue to encourage participation from Canada. **ACTION: JB**

LA will encourage participation from the individual US States through the American Association of State Geologists (AASG). The GSA meeting Oct will also provide an opportunity. **ACTION: LA**

GA will encourage South American countries to join. Gabriel noted that there were meetings coming up where he could promote OneGeology.

12. Involving the marine domain

12.1 The difficult issue of engaging the marine community and including data in OneGeology was discussed. It was noted that GeoScience Australia (GA) has a large amount of off-shore geological data that could be served. The OneGeology secretariat will contact GA (Ollie Raymond) requesting provision of marine data. **ACTION: KL.**

12.2 It was also noted that the EMODNET project should also feed into OneGeology. KA agreed to contact Helen Glaves (EMODNET coordinator) to enquire about marine data being available on the OneGeology global portal. **ACTION: KA.**

13. Plans for the IGC34 in 2012

13.1 OneGeology hopes to have 3 sessions in the programme – subject to success in getting abstracts.

13.2 We intend to hold an OMG meeting, a Steering Group meeting and a Technical Working Group meeting at the IGC. In addition, a ‘Directors open meeting’, facilitated by IJ will be held. It is also hoped that an exhibition space can be funded. It may be possible to approach CGMW or other global association to combine a booth.

13.3 The focus for OneGeology at the IGC was discussed. Potential ideas included the launch of an iPhone app, demo a new functionality, etc. IJ will take these ideas and draft a planning document. A potential press release will also be considered. **ACTION: IJ/Secretariat.**

13.4 BS is on the organising committee for the Geoscience Information Super Symposium and provided an update on planning and progress. OneGeology will be scheduled under Theme 3 and there will be 3 sessions. Poster presentations are being encouraged by the organisers due to the shortened time of the conference. Abstracts from other SDI’s will be invited to participate in a session e.g. OGC, GEO/GEOSS, CGI that will add a strategic level aspect to the sessions.

13.5 BS will forward official requests to the convenors to actively request abstracts now. There are no limits on the number of abstracts that can be submitted. **ACTION: BS – All convenors.**

14. Communications: including ideas for next newsletter

14.1 All were asked for any new ideas for the newsletter, which is circulated to over 2000 contacts worldwide. Topics for a ‘showcase’ or case study are also welcome. Please send all ideas to the secretariat. **ACTION: All.**

14.2 RT suggested that the winner of the competition (action on RT from meeting 5) to help us to define and establish that what we are doing is useful/needed, could be awarded at the IGC. A sponsor for the prize could be sought. A suggested competition was ‘best application using the OneGeology infrastructure’. It was AGREED that RT, IJ, KB will expand this idea further. **ACTION: RT, IJ, KB.**

15. Workshops, training and conferences

15.1 JP reported that he recently gave a workshop at a 3 Open Source GIS conference in Nottingham, UK. In this he used a Linux distribution DVD, ‘OS Geo’, which contained a variety of open source software but lacked data samples. JP suggested that OneGeology could take this opportunity to include OneGeology exemplar data on the DVD. The data is already freely available on the OneGeology web as the exemplar service so there is no

problem with IPR, etc. All AGREED that this was a good idea. JP will contact OS Geo proposing the idea. **ACTION: JP.**

15.2 The exemplar service is currently only available in MapServer format. BS and FR (via Agnes) said that they would provide a link to other open source versions. **ACTION: BS, FR (ATA).**

15.3 Upcoming conferences were noted –

- International cartographic conference in Paris next week
- ISDE7/WALIS, Perth. 23-25 August (IJ attending)
- GSA, Minneapolis. 9-12 October (LA, FR attending)
- AGU, San Francisco. 5-9 December – GeoSciML V3 will be released and 19,000 delegates expected. (Steve Richard attending)
- GIRAF workshop, Tanzania. 5-9 December (KA attending)
- Latin American Congress, Colombia. 29 Aug – 2 Sept. (Jose Mendia attending)
- German Geol Society meeting, 1-9 Sept, Munich (KA attending)
- CCOP meeting, Thailand. November (KW attending).

16. A.O.B.

Requests for a single downloadable map

- 16.1 A number of requests have been received for a cached map single download from the Portal. The possibilities and issues related to this suggestion were discussed.
- 16.2 LA reported that the US GIN is planning to take this route within their model and BS said that AuScope will have to do the same. RT suggested that IPR issues could arise.
- 16.3 KW suggested that an alternative option could be a combined simplified region map and KA proposed that the simplified (?27) rock type legend could be used. However, it was AGREED that these were two separate datasets, one being simplified map data, the other (cached version) is actual data. The issue needs further investigation.

Request for Google to use WMS1.3

- 16.4 Following discussions with Ed Parsons (Google) at the recent INSPIRE conference it was apparent that Google did not intend to update their handling of services to the WMS1.3 version. TD requested FR, in his role as OGC board member, to discuss this issue further and encourage Google to update. FR AGREED to enquire. **ACTION: FR.**

17. Date and location of next meeting

The next meeting will be held in conjunction with the ICG in Brisbane, August 2012. We will try to arrange the meeting immediately before the conference if possible. **ACTION: KL secretariat.**

K A Lee (nee Booth)
12th July 2011.
OneGeology secretariat.

Appendix 1: Comments from the YES Network

A representative from the YES Network was unable to attend the meeting: Joanne Venus, YES Network Chair, forwarded the following comments.

OneGeology Meeting YES Network notes

1. *NEW YES Officers*

-New Regional Representatives

Regional Representatives are new YES Network posts. These persons will coordinate Regional teams by linking in with both Organizational Reps and National Representatives.

-Organizational Coordination officer. This post will oversee YES Organizational Reps and be responsible for the day-to-day linkages with affiliated and other organizations.

The relevant representatives from the above new posts will be introduced formally to you once they are in post. We hope that by expanding our team we will be able to maximize reach into organizations and expand opportunities.

2. *GeosciML Course*

The YES Network is coordinating a joint venture at the GSA Fall meeting in Denver. An update of the event will be available after the session.

YES would be interested in co-hosting future short courses at other conferences/events.

3. *Future collaboration possibilities:*

- Link 1G Reps with relevant YES Regional Reps to encourage local collaboration
- Feature on 1G in YES Newsletter, perhaps written from an early career point of view
- Short courses at events

4. *YES2012*

The next YES Congress is being held in conjunction with the IGC in Brisbane in 2012. YES will run a series of sessions and workshops before the IGC and in the evenings during the IGC week: this is to ensure that YES members are able to present scientific research and work to their peers during IGC.

YES will be running 5 roundtable sessions on Women in Geoscience, Outreach, Professional Development and others and we will soon be looking to invite topical speakers to present during these sessions. Full session details will be available shortly and will be circulated widely.

We are open to suggestions of other collaborations in Brisbane.

Best wishes and again apologies for not being at the meeting

Joanne Venus