

Polar View Progress Meeting 9
Representation of the Free State of Bavaria
Rue Wiertz 77
Brussels, Belgium
February 17-19, 2011

AGENDA

Monday, January 17		
09:00	Welcome and Introductions	
09:15	Polar View Status Update	T. Puestow
09:45	GMES and Bavaria	M. Schroeder
10:15	European Arctic Strategy	I. Shepherd
10:45	Break	
11:00	European Ice Services	H. Tangen
11:30	MyOcean	L. Toudal
12:00	Multi-Source Circumpolar Information	A. Fleming
12:30	Lunch	
13:30	Proposed EU Arctic Information Centre	A. Vitikka
14:00	GMES Update	D. Geudtner
14:30	EMSA/CleanSeaNet	O. Trieschmann
15:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roundtable discussions: visions, future plans and prospects for collaboration with GMES • EU Arctic Information Center • EU Arctic Strategy • Other / national initiatives 	
16:30	Signing of the Polar View Charter	
17:00	Adjourn	

PARTICIPANTS

- Thomas, Puestow, C-CORE (TP)
- Desmond Power, C-CORE (DP)
- Florian Appel, VISTA (FA)
- Heike Bach, VISTA (HB)
- Sharon Irwin, Mission of Canada (Belgium) (SI)
- Geoff Sawyer, EARSC Secretary General (GS)
- Juha Petri Kärnä, SYKE (JPK)
- Juha Karvonen, FMI (JK)
- Manfred Schroeder, bavAIRia (MS)
- Joseph Cheek, IPF (JC)
- Andreas Cziferszky, BAS (AC)
- Andrew Fleming, BAS (AF)
- Ola Gråbak, ESA (OG)
- Richard Hall, KSAT (RH)
- Bertil Håkansson, SMHI (BH)
- Arto Vitikka, University of Lapland (AV)
- Tom Hirose, NOETIX (TH)
- Iréne Lake, SMHI (IL)
- Flavio Parmiggiani, ISAC-CNR (FP)
- Roberto Saldo, DTU (RS)
- Henning Shriver, DTU (HS)
- Christian Melsheimer, University of Bremen (CM)
- Leif Toudal Pederson, DMI (LT)
- Grant Bruce, Hatfield (GB)
- Jason Suwala, Hatfield (JS)
- Olaf Trieschmann, EMSA (OT)
- Helge Tangen, Met.No (HT)
- Dirk Geudtner, GMES Bureau (DG)
- Øyvind Hilmarsen, Tromsø Centre for Remote Technology (OH)
- Jerome Bequignon, ESA Brussels Office (JB)
- Iain Shepherd, EC-DG MARE (IS)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION – JANUARY 17, 2011

Welcome and Introductions

Welcome – Thomas Puestow

Went through meeting agenda and logistics.

1) Polar View Status Update (T. Puestow)

Status, accomplishments and remaining challenges – Thomas Puestow (supporting presentation)

2) bavAIRia Brief (M. Schroeder)

3) European Arctic Strategy (I. Shepherd)

OG suggests that Iain's progress report will be an important document. Asks if Polar View can contribute to the document. Iain suggests that we could send a paragraph. We could get access to a draft at some point.

Action: PV (TP) to provide paragraph to IS on description of PV that would fit into the report's context.

HY asks about Arctic Information Centre whether there is still traction on continuing with this centre. Iain suggests EC are waiting for a good proposal but there is no DG in the commission that have taken ownership of this. Arto Vitikka suggests that they are working on a proposal now. TP suggests moving Arto's presentation to earlier in the day so that Iain can see the details.

4) Proposed EU Arctic Information Centre (A. Vitikka)

The intent is to submit this proposal to the Commission. The intent is to make this proposal convincing enough so that it will make it logical for the commission to fund. Iain thinks this is a great idea but it has been difficult to try and get someone in the EC to take ownership of this.

OG – any thoughts about making this the home of the Polar View network? AV suggests this is possible but he is not the one who decides. TP suggests this is a natural fit. The AIC could be a funding mechanism to keep Polar View alive in Europe. AF suggests that including PV into this centre is an extension beyond which is currently proposed (i.e., NRT services based on satellite). But it is an obvious and necessary fit – it wouldn't make sense to have this centre and then have Polar View outside of this. Consensus is that PV should really fit within this centre.

TP asks if there is a catalog of requirements that fit within this centre – AV suggests that this has to be done. TP suggests a dedicated meeting between PV and this centre (in

Tromso) that would define how PV fits within this centre). OH suggests that the PV services fits well within this centre and we should try to make this work.

5) European Ice Services (H. Tangen)

Asks what is the difference between EIS and My Ocean. LT will give presentation on My Ocean. My Ocean provides basic information that could be used for an ice service, providing marine forecasts. Forecasts from My Ocean would be provided to EIS that would be used to provide the ice services. So EIS uses My Ocean products.

OG asks if EIS has strategy to expand into a more circumpolar services rather than the national interests that DMI, Met.no and FMI currently has. HT suggest this would be done on an automated basis (no sea ice analysts assigned to do this – automated computer generation). It is not meant to go global with EIS products in the same way that national ice charts are generated. RH suggests that ICEMAR products would be made available globally (for example to the Canadian Ice Service if the coverage goes into the Canadian Arctic).

6) Multi-Source Circumpolar Information (A. Fleming)

OT suggests that it is good that Polar View provides data in OGC standard formats. In fact, he suggests it should be mandatory. AF notes that OGD data are good, but they aren't good enough for delivery to ships.

OG high resolution ice charts that a lot of local resources to product – will Europe be provide these resources to provide a more complete global picture of the ice regime? This is a question to EIS? This could be part of GMES in Europe to make sure that this gets included. Suggested therefore that in order for ICEMAR to fit properly within GMES, that this should be done. RH suggests that this is part of the ICEMAR project. OG suggests that there is no funding for going beyond the national ice centre's scopes that this could be what GMES provides – funding for ice monitoring outside of National Ice Centre's interests.

7) MyOcean (L. Toudal)

OT asks if there is a duplication between MyOcean and Polar View on sea ice products? OT still has that impression despite LT's presentation. LT suggests that this confusion was apparent when MyOcean was launched. MyOcean does not do sea ice charting. They take sea ice charts and convert it into a form that is useful for modeling and forecasting. TAC converts data that are already out there (from Polar View and etc.) and convert it into a form that is useful for modeling (i.e., input to My Ocean). So TAC does not duplicate PV products but just converts it.

TP asks to give an example of how My Ocean produces ice charts. LT suggests that ice centres product charts, TAC converts to a gridded format (i.e., downconverts it to be compatible with model). My Ocean forecast model products winds, sea ice temps, etc.

This is then used by ice centre for forecasting of ice information that Ice Centres would use. So ice centres product now products, while the My Ocean ice products are forecasts for tomorrow. So My Ocean will provide this forecast information (not provided now). Some users make require higher resolution products of specific area. My Ocean provides wide scale information but users may in fact want high details, such as in fjords or etc. So there is room to invent new downstream service from My Ocean information.

OT asks if ice forecasting is a downstream or core service? TP suggests that all of us had a heck of a time trying to differentiate between core and downstream service definition. Core services are what EO can pay for (pan European Services) while downstream service might be of national interests (higher resolution ice charts for example). LT suggest that an analogy might be regarding weather forecasts, it is of EU interest to provide pan European forecasts since these are necessary for ice charting but maybe national weather centres might not be able to provide this – but they would certainly use that.

Asks if Sentinel launch delay affects any of these products. LT suggests that this is filled in a bit by extending the ENVISAT mission to 2013. Hopefully ENVISAT will be maintained long enough so that we don't have a gap.

IS suggests that he often has to explain all of these technical details for very non-technical people. Suggests My Ocean, PV has to improve communication so that non-technical people can understand this.

8) GMES Update D. Geudtner

Mentioned an Arctic thematic call that would be broad covering monitoring.

TP Asked about European User Forum. DG suggests that this will be nominated through their national representatives. They would represent real users and not scientists – of the GMES services. Member states have been informed about the requests and we have already some nominations from some countries.

OG asks if downstream and core services nomenclature is still being used. DG suggests it isn't used as much – just GMES services.

Question on Marine services - Marine services include EMSA, Safe Sea Net and MyOcean. Note that MyOcean currently has funding to 2012 – proposal has been submitted in November for continued funding beyond 2012. DG can't say very much right now because the proposals are currently being evaluated.

Will public good data policy extent to international aid programs? DG says that some of the third party satellite operators are afraid to let data do beyond the GMES projects but data from Sentinel satellites should be available.

TP – is GMES thinking about snow products? Snow has been difficult to characterize by it fits into energy. Right now it doesn't really fit into anything. DG – it something that needs further discussion to see what aspects of snow need to be pursued. RH – the snow service providers need guidance on who to characterize this. DG suggests that we need to characterize the users of the service – TP suggests that PV already has done this and we could provide it to EC. If PV has user characterization, we can funnel this through GMES Bureau so that they have documentation on service requirements. TP – indeed we already have this done and can pass this on to the GMES Bureau.

Action: TP to discuss this issue with DG offline and maybe provide documentation of users need documentation that PV has already.

OG – when does the marine call come out? DG – we need to get the funding allocated for this. Already a call on marine and atmosphere that was due in November that will possibly support MyOcean (they have a proposal in for further funding).

RH – will there be more pilot services like ICEMAR? DG - No there will not.

9) EMSA/CleanSeaNet (O. Trieschmann)

Service has to be 30 minutes NRT capability – for this reason there are several service providers (KSAT, CLS, eGeos).

What is resolution of SAR data used by EMSA? RSAT provides ScanSAR NarrowB and Wide Swath from ENVISAT. Areas are covered about 3 times per week. Note that this isn't ALL of the available satellite orbits.

EMSA looks like a downstream service – why was this funded by EC; doesn't EC only fund core services? OT says this isn't a GMES service but funded directly by European Union.

TP asks about standardization of service chains from different users. The processing chains are responsibility of service providers but the quality and the products have to be consistent and there are standard for transmission data to EMSA from each of the service providers.

OG congratulates EMSA on this successful GMES project in securing funding for the national service providers and securing requirements for satellite data. This is an excellent model to follow to bring a service up to a European Level. Is EMSA a pilot user of MyOcean data (EMSA does forecasting and backtracking). OT says they have an agreement with MyOcean for data.

Has there been discussions of expanding EMSA to the arctic since shipping to the arctic is expected to increase? OT – EMSA will never do anything beyond its mandate. So we would need to get funding to do this from member states. EMSA follows various

directives from member states and we would need to get permission from member states to go beyond its present mandate.

10) EU Arctic Policy – Steffen Weber

On Thursday, policy will be discussed in parliament; focus on sustainable development of the Arctic region; priorities will be defined (e.g., Northern sea route, natural resources, indigenous peoples, environment).

EU Arctic Forum has been established. Group of MPs from all different parties. With all different interests (energy, environment, etc). This is a platform for knowledge input to the political process in Brussels.

On Thursday, the European Parliament will recommend that the Northern Sea Route will be developed. This will be voted on – we shall see if it passes.

EU Arctic Forum will be issuing a newsletter. This will be a way for the forum to communicate and it hopes that there will be feedback from the community on what Forum is doing. There should be information in the newsletter on how to provide feedback?

TP – so the feedback mechanism could be through you (SW)? Yes.

OG – Europe is well positioned to be doing something for the arctic – the right satellites are being launched to do this (Sentinels) and we have something to offer to the arctic. SW agreed.

SW – the Arctic Information Centre (the proposal mentioned earlier) will be a means to push arctic policy within the EU.

Side Note: AV will be meeting/calling IS to discuss timing of the arctic information centre proposal. This will determine when the proposal could be submitted to the EC.